



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

PROPERTY OF
*University of
Michigan
Library*
1817

AR 1

IR 1 AS

THE
ENGLISH REVIEW.

VOL. XVII.

APRIL—JULY.

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

1852.

PROPERTY OF
*University of
Michigan
Library*

1817

Aug 17

1817



THE
ENGLISH REVIEW.

VOL. XVII.
APRIL—JULY.

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

1852.

AP

4

E 58

U. 11

LONDON :

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

INDEX

OF

BOOKS REVIEWED.

. For remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, No Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

- Adam Graeme, of Mossgray.* By the Author of "Mrs. Margaret Maitland," 423.
- Alastor—"Excelsior;" or the Realms of Poesie.* By Alastor, 429.
- Allerton and Dreux; or, the War of Opinion.* By the Author of a Rhyming Chronicle, 230. 249.
- Alison—The Life of John, Duke of Marlborough, with some Account of his Contemporaries, and of the War of the Succession.* By Archibald Alison, LL.D., 1.
- An Article of the Christian Faith.* Reprinted from the "Morning Chronicle" of Oct. 22, 1851, 337.
- Anchurus, and other Poems.* By William Ewart, M.A., Curate of Pimperne, 229.
- Anderson—The Three Paths; or, Truth, Vanity, and Profession.* By the Hon. Mrs. Anderson, 230. 460.
- Anglo-Catholic Theory, the.* By Bonamy Price, 169.
- Apocalypse—The Spiritual Exposition of the; as derived from the Writings of the Hon. Emmanuel Swedenborg.* By the Rev. Augustus Clissold, M.A., 209.
- Apostolical Epistles—Annotations on the; designed chiefly for the use of Students of the Greek text.* By Thomas Williamson Peile, D.D., 327.
- Arnold—Homer's Iliad. With English Notes and Grammatical References.* Edited by the Rev. Thomas Kerchever Arnold, 452.
- Arnold—Spelling turned Etymology. Part I.* By the Rev. T. K. Arnold, 455.
- Atherley—England, her Colonies, and her Enemies.* By E. G. Atherley, 315.
- Atlas of General and Descriptive Geography, the School.* By Alex. Keith Johnston, 227.
- Atlas of Physical Geography, the School.* By Alex. Keith Johnston, 227.
- Babylon and Jerusalem—A*
dressed to Ida, Countess
Hahn. From the German
- Badger—The Nestorians*
Rituals; with the Narrati
sion to Mesopotamia and Co
the Rev. George P. Badger
- Barton—Confirmation. A*
the Rev. R. W. Barton, 4
- Baxter—Village Sermons.*
Volume. By the Rev.
Baxter, 454.
- Beames—The Rookeries of*
Present, and Prospective.
Thomas Beames, M.A., 31
- Bellis' Sermons,* 230.
- Bennett—A Pastoral Letter*
rishioners of Frome. By
J. E. Bennett, 225.
- Bennett—Lives of certain*
Church. Edited by the R
Bennett. Vol. III., 461.
- Bennett—Our Doctor and o*
Kirkbeck. Edited by the
E. Bennett, M.A., 257.
- Berens—Stedfast Adherence*
of England, recommended
in Three Village Sermons
Story. By the Rev. Ed
454.
- Blandford, Marquis of—His*
late the Duties of Ecclesias
and for the Management and
of Episcopal and Capitul
Prepared by the Marquis
and Lord Robert Grosven
- Book of Common Prayer of t*
England, the; adapted fo
in other Protestant Church
- Bosworth—The Origin of*
Germanic, and Scandinavia
and Nations; with a Sk
early Literature. By the
Bosworth, D.D., 211.
- Bowen—Mount Athos, Thesse*
rus; being a Diary of a

- Constantinople to Corfu.* By George F. Bowen, Esq., M.A., 453.
- British Churchmen, the,* 104.
- Browne—Bleak House.* By Charles Dickens. With Illustrations by H. K. Browne. No. I., 430.
- Browne—A Handbook of Hebrew Antiquities; for the use of Schools and Students.* By the Rev. Henry Browne, M.A., 455.
- Buckley—Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible.* Abridged, modernized, &c., by Theodore Alois Buckley, B.A., 449.
- Buckley—The Catechism of the Council of Trent; translated into English, with Notes.* By Theodore Alois Buckley, B.A., 227.
- Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible.* Abridged, modernized, &c., by Theodore Alois Buckley, B.A., 449.
- Campbell—Trials of a Minister.* By the Rev. A. D. Campbell, 470.
- Cardinal Wolsey—The Life of.* By George Cavendish, his Gentleman Usher, 468.
- Caswall—Synodal Action necessary to the Church.* By the Rev. H. Caswall, 470.
- Caswell's American Church,* 230.
- Chaldee Reading Lessons; consisting of the whole of the Biblical Chaldee, with a Grammatical Praxis, and an Interlineary Translation,* 464.
- Chesney—Observations on the Past and Present State of Fire-arms and on the probable Effects in War of the New Musket.* By Col. Chesney, D.C.L., Royal Artillery, 142.
- Christian Science, Elements of.* By Adams, 230.
- Church of Christ, the; in its Ideas, Attributes, and Ministry; with a particular reference to the Controversy on the Subject between Romanists and Protestants.* By Edward Arthur Litton, M.A., 289.
- Church of the Invisible, the; or, the World of Spirits; a Manual for Christian Mourners.* By Robert Montgomery, M.A., 210.
- Church Sunday School Magazine, 1851. Vol. VI.,* 228.
- Clissold—The Spiritual Exposition of the Apocalypse; as derived from the Writings of the Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg.* By the Rev. Augustus Clissold, M.A., 209.
- Confession, Penance, and Absolution.* By Mr. Roger Laurence, a layman of Queen Anne's time, 465.
- Confirmation, a Gift at; a Selection of Poems illustrative of* 466.
- Confirmation Lectures Village Congregation Oxford.* By Alfred Congregational Psalm of the Church of 1 Rev. H. Hughes, 45
- Continuous Confutation ham Lectures.* By 1
- Convocation—The Law Reform of,* 470.
- Cornwall, Barry—English smaller Poems.* By 424.
- Council of Trent, C Translated into En by Theodore Alois B*
- Cox—The Crimes of t By the Rev. J. C. C*
- Coxe—Sympathies of t Proposals for a New John Baptist von Translated by the R land Coxe, 427.*
- Crescent and the Cross, Crowfort—Bishop Pea tures on the Acts of Annals of St. Paul. lish, with a few Not fort, B.D., 462.*
- Crystal Palace, the,* 230
- Currey—The Preparati as exhibited in the Israelites.* By Geor 227.
- Davis—The Republic lated into English, tion, Analysis, and Davis, M.A., and D. 453.*
- De Teissier on the Lord Devotions for the Sic Thanksgivings, with t the use of Sick P Friends, during Sicki covery, 423.*
- Dickens—Bleak Hou Dickens. With Illus Browne. No. I., 430*
- Dickson—Asylum for t Dickson, 460.*
- Divine Master, the,* 407
- Dixon—Sermons.* By D. Dixon, 459.
- Dixon—The Songs of th Poems.* By the Re 462.
- Doane, Bishop; his Cor*

- and Lecture on the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge*, 469.
- Dodgson—Ritual Worship*. By the Rev. C. Dodgson, 470.
- Dowell—A Catechism on the Services of the Church of England*. By the Rev. S. W. Dowell, 464.
- Drury—Arundines Cami, sive Cantabrigiensium Lusus Canori*, Collegit atque Edidit Henricus Drury, A.M., 38.
- Ecclesiastical Persons—A Bill to enable Her Majesty further to regulate the Duties of; and to make better Provisions for the Management and Distribution of Episcopal and Capitular Revenues*. Prepared and brought in by the Marquis of Blandford and Lord Robert Grosvenor, 391.
- Ecclesiastical Synods, some Objections to the Revival of,—answered by a Reference to the Circumstances under which the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem was assembled*. Sermon by the Rev. George Domville Wheeler, M.A., 427.
- Eclipse of Faith, the; or, a Visit to a Religious Sceptic*, 273.
- England before the Norman Conquest*. By the Author of "Domestic Scenes in Greenland and Iceland," 230. 466.
- England, her Colonies, and her Enemies*. By E. G. Atherley, Esq., 315.
- English Songs and other smaller Poems*. By Barry Cornwall, 424.
- Ewart—Anchurus, and other Poems*. By William Ewart, M.A., 229.
- "Excelsior;" or, the Realms of Poesie*. By Alastor, 429.
- Excerpta à Testamento Veteri*, 38.
- Exiled Soul, the*, 230. 460.
- Faber—Lethe, and other Poems*. By Sophia Woodroffe. Posthumously edited by G. S. Faber, B.D., Master of Sherborne Hospital, 431.
- Fairbairn—The Revelation of St. John, expounded for those who search the Scriptures*. By E. W. Hengstenberg, Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, 211.
- Far-off; or, Asia and Australia described; with Anecdotes and numerous Illustrations*, 459.
- Fellows—Sayings and Doings of the Lord Bishop of Manchester*. By the Rev. E. Fellows, 470.
- Fiction, but not Falsehood; a Tale of the Times*, 459.
- Fire-arms; Observations on the Past and Present State of*. By Colonel Chesney, Royal Artillery, 142.
- First Annual Statement of the Society for Protecting the Rights of Conscience*, 225.
- Flower—Non-Episcopal Orders*. By the Rev. W. B. Flower, 470.
- Forbes on the Christian Sacrifice*, 230.
- Gale—The First Principles of Labour, Property, and Money, demand primary Consideration for Home Agriculture*. By R. Gale, 412.
- Gibbings—Were Heretics ever burned alive at Rome? A Report of the Proceedings in the Roman Inquisition against Fulgentio Manfredi*. By the Rev. Richard Gibbings, 465.
- Gladstone—A Letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, on his proposed measure for the Colonial Church*, by a Dignitary of that Church, 469.
- Gladstone—A Letter to the Right Rev. William Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen, on the Functions of Laymen in the Church*. By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., 337.
- Golden Legend, the*. By Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, 435.
- Gordon—The Spirit and Scope of Education, in promoting the well-being of Society*. From the German of the Very Rev. J. A. Stapf, by Robert Gordon, 461.
- Grammar, the Elements of; taught in English; with Questions*. By the Rev. Edward Thring, M.A., 455.
- Guiana, Charge of the Bishop of*, 469.
- Gurney—Faust; a Tragedy. Part II., rendered from the German of Goethe*. By Archer Gurney, 104.
- Gurney—King Charles I.; a Dramatic Poem*. By the Rev. Archer Gurney, 104.
- Gurney—Love's Legends. Poems*. By Archer Gurney, 104.
- Hall—Meditations and Vows, &c.* By Joseph Hall, D.D., Bishop of Norwich, 460.
- Handbook of Hebrew Antiquities, a; for the use of Schools and Students*. By the Rev. Henry Browne, M.A., 455.
- Happy Family, the; or, Selfishness and Self-denial*, 430.
- Hawthorne's Scarlet Letter*, 230.
- Hawthorne—Twice-told Tales*. By Nathaniel Hawthorne, 457.
- Hay—A Letter to the Society of Arts, on*

- duction, by Andrew S. Scoble, 230. 464.
- Luther; or, Rome and the Reformation.* By Robert Montgomery, M.A., 228.
- Lyra Christiana; Poems on Christianity and the Church, original and selected from the Works of Robert Montgomery, M.A.,* 417.
- Lyricorum Sacrorum Clavis Metrica.* Scriptore F. Hodgson, 38.
- Lyttelton—The Leaven of the Kingdom of God. A Sermon, by the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttelton,* 470.
- McCaul — The Messiahship of Jesus. The concluding Series of Twelve Lectures on the Prophecies, &c.* By A. McCaul, D.D., 467.
- Manchester and Salford Education Bill, the; Infidel in its Principle, &c.,* 469.
- Mant—The Man of Sorrows. The mental Sufferings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, during his Passion, considered in Five Discourses.* By the Ven. Walter B. Mant, Archdeacon of Down, 426.
- Marlborough, The Life of John, Duke of, with some Account of his Contemporaries, and of the War of the Succession.* By Archibald Alison, LL.D., 1.
- Married Persons, Prayers for; Daily and Occasional. Selected from various sources, chiefly from the Ancient Liturgies,* 422.
- Mason—Pictures of Life in Mexico.* By R. H. Mason, 212.
- Maurice—The Old Testament: Nineteen Sermons on the First Lessons for the Sundays from Septuagesima to the Third Sunday after Trinity.* By the Rev. F. D. Maurice, 451.
- Medwin—Sermons preached at the Guild of the Holy Cross, Stratford-upon-Avon.* By the Rev. R. T. Medwin, 230. 463.
- Michaud's History of the Crusades, Translated from the French by W. Robson,* 451.
- Miller — Sermons preached at Bognor.* By the Rev. Edward Miller, 230. 461.
- Montgomery—The Church of the Invisible, or World of Spirits. A Manual for Christian Mourners.* By Robert Montgomery, M.A., 210.
- Montgomery—Luther; or, Rome and the Reformation.* By Robert Montgomery, M.A., 228.
- Montgomery—Lyra Christiana; Poems on Christianity and the Church, original and selected from the Works of Robert Montgomery, M.A.,* 417.

- Monthly Packet of Evening Readings for Younger Members of the English Church.* Vol. II., 450.
- Moodie—Roughing it in the Bush; or, Life in Canada.* By Susannah Moodie, 379.
- Mortmain, Report on the Law of.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed July 17th, 1801, 49.
- Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus: being a Diary of a Journey from Constantinople to Corfu.* By George F. Bowdler Esq., M.A., 453.
- Murray's Readings for the Rail,* 28. 467.
- Mythology for Versification.* By the Rev. F. Hodgson, Provost of Eton College, 38.
- National Christianity an Article of the Christian Faith; a Sermon preached at Kidderminster by the Rev. Charles Wordsworth, M.A.,* 337.
- Neale—Sequentiæ ex Missalibus Germanicis, Anglicis, Gallicis, &c., recensita notulisque instruxit Joannes M. Neale, A.M.,* 452.
- Nestorians, the; and their Rituals: with the Narrative of a Mission to Mesopotamia and Coordistan.* By the Rev. George P. Badger, 443.
- New Jersey, Report of the Proceedings at the Special Convention of the Diocese of,* 469.
- Newman—Discourses to mixed Congregations.* By John Henry Newman, 49.
- Newman—Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England.* By John Henry Newman, D.D., Priest of the Congregation of St. Philip Neri, 49.
- Nuns and Nunneries; Sketches compiled entirely from Romish Authorities,* 434.
- Old Oak Chest, the; a Tale of Domestic Life.* By G. P. R. James, Esq., 422.
- Oxford, Bishop of—The Planting of Nations a great Responsibility. A Sermon by the Bishop of Oxford,* 470.
- Palmoni: an Essay on the Chronological and Numerical Systems in use among the Ancient Jews,* 451.
- Parochial Tales,* 416.
- Pears—Sermons by the Rev. Stewart Pears, B.D.,* 459.
- Pearson—Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles.* By Bishop Pearson, 230.
- Pearson—Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii auctore Joanne Pearson Episcopo,*

- Cestrensi. Editio nova Annotationibus et Præfatione ad hodiernum controversiæ statum accommodata*, 452.
- Peile—A Brief Argument for reviving in the Church and Realm of England the Ancient Synodal Action.* By T. W. Peile, D.D., 230.
- Peile—Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles, designed chiefly for the use of Students of the Greek Text.* By Thomas Williamson Peile, D.D., 327.
- Penrose—Fifty-four Sermons written for Sunday Reading in Families.* By the Rev. John Penrose, M.A., 230. 450.
- Pigott—The Patriarch of the Nile; or, Truth Triumphant. A Poem in Two Cantos.* By J. D. Pigott, 230. 467.
- Pious Churchman, the; a Manual of Devotion and Spiritual Instruction*, 460.
- Pinart—The Nourishment of the Christian Soul; or, Mental Prayer rendered Easy, by Meditation on the Passion of our Lord.* From the French of Pinart, 465.
- Polonius; a Collection of Wise Saws and Modern Instances*, 456.
- Pott—Confirmation Lectures delivered to a Village Congregation in the Diocese of Oxford.* By Alfred Pott, M.A., 449.
- Price—The Anglo-Catholic Theory.* By Bonamy Price, 169.
- Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers, Memoirs of*, 198.
- Propugnacula.* By Aug. Guest, LL.D., 470.
- Reginald Hastings*, 198.
- Remarks on the Rev. Charles Wordsworth's Sermon on National Christianity*, 337.
- Remedies suggested for some of the Evils which constitute the Perils of the Nation*, 315.
- Rivington—Church Extension in St. Pancras.* By William Rivington, 226.
- Robertson—Two Lectures on the Influence of Poetry on the Working Classes, delivered before the Members of the Mechanics' Institution, February, 1852.* By the Rev. Fred. W. Robertson, M.A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 426.
- Robson—Michaud's History of the Crusades.* Translated from the French by W. Robson, 451.
- Rookeries of London, the; Past, Present and Prospective.* By the Rev. Thomas Beames, M.A., 315.
- Rose—The Affghans, the Ten Tribes, and the Kings of the East, the Druses the Moabites.* By Sir George Rose, 469.
- Roughing it in the Bush; or, Life in Canada.* By Susannah Moodie, 379.
- Routledge's Popular Library.* 230.
- Russell—Homæopathy in 1851.* Edited by J. Rutherford Russell, M.D., 457.
- Sacra Privata, &c.* By Bishop Wilson. With Notes and an Appendix by a Priest of the Church of England, 452.
- Sacred Lyrics for Versification.* By the Rev. F. Hodgson, 38.
- St. Saviour's, Leeds—Letters to the Parishioners of.* By the Vicar, 470.
- Scoble—The Poetical Works of James Russell Lowell.* Edited, with an Introduction, by Andrew S. Scoble, 464.
- Scott—Apostolical Succession and Canon LV.* By Rev. W. R. Scott, 470.
- Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, The.* Vol. I., from Jan. to Dec., 1851, 224.
- Scudamore—Letters to a Seceder from the Church of England to the Communion of Rome.* By W. E. Scudamore, M.A., 49.
- Skinner—A Guide for Lent; with Devotions and Scripture Sections for each Day.* By the Rev. J. Skinner, 455.
- Smith—The Preaching of the Cross, and the Visible Church: a Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Bishop of Norwich.* By the Rev. Theyre T. Smith, 444.
- Songs of the Bells, the*, 280.
- Spelling turned Etymology. Part I.* By the Rev. T. K. Arnold, 455.
- Spencer—Life and Death; a Series of Meditations addressed from the French of Nouet.* Edited by the Rev. C. C. Spencer, 458.
- Spurrell—"Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy," and the "Reply" of the Superior*, 469.
- Staff—The Spirit and Scope of Education in promoting the Well-being of Society. From the German of the Very Rev. J. A. Stapf.* By Robert Gordon, 230. 461.
- State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity, on the. Part II.*, 230. 466.
- Stedfast Adherence to the Church of England, recommended and enforced in Three Village Sermons and a Village Story.* By the Rev. Edward Berens, 454.
- Steel—The Revelations of Astronomy.* By the Rev. T. H. Steel, 46.
- Stopford—A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Marshall, late a Clergyman of the Church of England, now a Roman Priest.* By the Rev. E. A. Stopford, Archdeacon of Meath, 49.

Stracey—How can we have Three Services? By Mr. Stracey, 470.

Stuart—Sermon on the Pew System. By the Rev. E. Stuart, 470.

Sunset Reverie, the: an Allegory, 428.

Sydney, Letter from the Bishop of, to Dr. Wiseman, 469.

Synodal Action—A Brief Argument for Reviving in the Church and Realm of England, the ancient. By S. W. Peile, D.D., 230.

Synodal Question—A Catena of Episcopal Authorities, on the; Extracts from Charges recently delivered by Dignitaries of the Church of England, 446.

Syriac and Chaldee Reading Lessons, 230. 469.

Tales of Kirkbeck. Edited by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, M.A., 257.

Tasmania, Charge of the Bishop of, 469.

Thompson—New Medical Dictionary for the People. By Dr. Thompson, 469.

Thoughts on several Subjects. By the Author of "Memoirs of a Working Man," 446.

Thring—The Elements of Grammar taught in English; with Questions. By the Rev. Edward Thring, M.A., 455.

Tremenheere—The Political Evidence of the Ancients, in its Bearing upon Modern Times. By Hugh Seymour Tremenhreere, 466.

Trevor—Church Synods, the Institution of Christ. By G. Trevor, M.A., 470.

Trevor—Sermons on the Doctrines and Means of Grace, &c. By the Rev. G. Trevor, 459.

Twice-told Tales, 230.

Urquhart—Life and Times of Francisco Sforza, Duke of Milan; with a Preliminary Sketch of the History of Italy. By W. Pollard Urquhart, Esq., 444.

Vaughan—Deserters from the Congregation. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., 470.

Vaughan—The Ministry of Reconciliation. A Sermon. By the Rev. E. T. Vaughan, 470.

Vaughan—The Republic of Plato. Translated into English with an Introduction, Analysis, and Notes. By J. L. Davies, M.A., and D. J. Vaughan, M.A., 453.

Walther—A Reply to Phases of Faith. By Walther, 230.

Ward—Oxford University Statutes. Translated to 1843 by the late G. R. M. Ward, Esq., M.A., and completed under the superintendence of James Heywood, Esq., 224.

Watkins—The Human Hand, and other Poems. By the Rev. C. F. Watkins, 450.

Welsh Sketches. By the Author of "Proposals for Christian Union," 457.

Whiting—Rural Thoughts. By Whiting, 230.

Wiesinger—Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, Titus, and First to Timothy. By August Wiesinger. Translated by the Rev. G. Tralton, 458.

Wild—England as it is, and as it might be. By Justus Wild, 470.

Wilkinson's Sermons, 230.

Wilks—The Popes: an Historical Summary: from Linus to Pius IX., carefully compiled from the best Ecclesiastical Authorities. By G. A. F. Wilks, D.D., 212.

Wilmshurst—Sermons on Church Subjects. By the Rev. H. F. Wilmshurst, 470.

Wilson—Four Sermons on the Deity and Incarnation of our Lord. By the Rev. B. Wilson, 469.

Wilson—Sacra Privata, &c. By Bishop Wilson. With Notes and an Appendix by a Priest of the Church of England, 452.

Woodford—Lectures on Church History. By the Rev. J. R. Woodford, 470.

Wordsworth, Dr., his Jubilee Sermon, 469.

Wordsworth—Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of the Book of Revelations? By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., 223.

Wordsworth—National Christianity an Article of the Christian Faith: a Sermon preached at Kidderminster. By the Rev. Charles Wordsworth, 337.

Wordsworth—Occasional Sermons. By the Rev. C. Wordsworth, D.D., 470.

Wordsworth—Reply to Mr. Gladstone's Letter to the Bishop of Aberdeen on the Functions of Laymen in the Church. By the Rev. Charles Wordsworth, Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond, 337.

Zingru, the Gipsy. By Annette Marie Maillard, 465.

Roughing it in the Bush; or, Life in Canada. By Susannah Moodie, 379.
Routledge's Popular Library. 230.
Russell—Homœopathy in 1851. Edited by J. Rutherford Russell, M.D., 457.
Sacra Privata, &c. By Bishop Wilson. With Notes and an Appendix by a Priest of the Church of England, 452.
Sacred Lyrics for Versification. By the Rev. F. Hodgson, 38.
St. Saviour's, Leeds—Letters to the Parishioners of. By the Vicar, 470.
Scoble—The Poetical Works of James Russell Lowell. Edited, with an Introduction, by Andrew S. Scoble, 462.
Scott—Apostolical Succession and Communion. By Rev. W. R. Scott, 470.
Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, The. Vol. I., from Jan. to Dec., 1851, 224.
Scudamore—Letters to a Seceder from the Church of England to the Communion of Rome. By W. E. Scudamore, M.A., 49.
Skinner—A Guide for Lent; with Devotions and Scripture Sections for each Day. By the Rev. J. Skinner, 453.
Smith—The Preaching of the Cross, and the Visible Church: a Sermon preached at the Ordination of the Bishop of Norwich. By the Rev. Theyre T. Smith, 444.
Songs of the Bells, the, 280.
Spelling turned Etymology. Part I. By the Rev. T. K. Arnold, 455.
Spencer—Life and Death; a Series of Meditations addressed from the Friends of Nouet. Edited by the Rev. C. C. Spencer, 458.
Spurrell—"Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy," and the "Reply" of the Superior, 469.
Staff—The Spirit and Scope of Education in promoting the Well-being of Society from the German of the Very Rev. J. A. Staff. By Robert Gordon, 230. 461.
State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity, on the. Part II. 230. 466.
Stedfast Adherence to the Church of England, recommended and enforced in Three Village Sermons and a Village Story. By the Rev. Edward Berens, 454.
Steel—The Revelations of Astronomy. By the Rev. T. H. Steel, 46.
Stopford—A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Marshall, late a Clergyman of the Church of England, now a Roman Priest. By the Rev. E. A. Stopford, Archdeacon of Meath, 49.

Stracey—How can we have Three Services? By Mr. Stracey, 470.
Stuart—Sermon on the Pew System. By the Rev. E. Stuart, 470.
Sunset Reverie, the: an Allegory, 428.
Sydney, Letter from the Bishop of, to Dr. Wiseman, 469.
Synodal Action—A Brief Argument for Reviving in the Church and Realm of England, the ancient. By S. W. Peile, D.D., 230.
Synodal Question—A Catena of Episcopal Authorities, on the; Extracts from Charges recently delivered by Dignitaries of the Church of England, 446.
Syrinc and Chaldee Reading Lessons, 230. 469.
Tales of Kirkbeck. Edited by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, M.A., 257.
Tasmania, Charge of the Bishop of, 469.
Thompson—New Medical Dictionary for the People. By Dr. Thompson, 469.
Thoughts on several Subjects. By the Author of "Memoirs of a Working Man," 446.
Thring—The Elements of Grammar taught in English; with Questions. By the Rev. Edward Thring, M.A., 455.
Tremenheere—The Political Evidence of the Ancients, in its Bearing upon Modern Times. By Hugh Seymour Tremmenheere, 466.
Trevor—Church Synods, the Institution of Christ. By G. Trevor, M.A., 470.
Trevor—Sermons on the Doctrines and Means of Grace, &c. By the Rev. G. Trevor, 459.
Twice-told Tales, 230.
Urquhart—Life and Times of Francisco Sforza, Duke of Milan; with a Preliminary Sketch of the History of Italy. By W. Pollard Urquhart, Esq., 444.
Vaughan—Deserters from the Congregation. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D., 470.
Vaughan—The Ministry of Reconciliation. A Sermon. By the Rev. E. T. Vaughan, 470.
Vaughan—The Republic of Plato. Translated into English with an Introduction, Analysis, and Notes. By J. L. Davies, M.A., and D. J. Vaughan, M.A., 453.
Walther—A Reply to Phases of Faith. By Walther, 230.

XIV., of James II., of Charles XII., are all drawn with delicacy and power, yet all made subordinate to the principal figure on the canvas. The masterly sieges, the brilliant victories are brought with careful accuracy, yet with startling reality, before the eye, whilst the mind is relieved in the interim by colouring of a more subdued tone; reposes after its past excitement, and prepares for fresh exertion and increased rapture; yet even in these calmer scenes, never for an instant loses the consciousness of the power, the influence, the all-pervading presence of JOHN DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH.

But we must pause ere we enter on the subject matter of these volumes, and find a few faults with our able and agreeable author: for faults he has in company with his fellow-mortals.

And, first, we must object to certain peculiarities of expression, especially to the use of the word *AWANTING*, which we have counted some nine or ten times in the first volume. We know, indeed, of one, and but one authority, for the use of this word; and we will give Mr. Alison the benefit of our knowledge, and adduce the testimony in question. There is, then, an ancient Scottish game—a game of forfeits, in which the party assume different nicknames, the most common being White Cap, Red Cap, Green Cap, Yellow Cap, Blatter at the Barn Door, and Ruff-rum-ly totty cap; the players being arranged in a circle, one who stands in the centre commences thus; “*Parson's Mare's AWANTING!* Who has her? Some say one thing, and some say another. But I say, But I say, But I say, RUFF-RUM-LY TOTTY CAP,” or any other name of those present.

Now, although we have ourselves spent many a happy hour in the game alluded to, we scarcely deem it as furnishing *alone* a sufficient evidence in favour of the classical character of the word in question; and we assure our readers, that it is the only instance on record where the word is introduced into the standard literature of our language.

Another fault of Mr. Alison is, the practice in which he indulges of constantly repeating the same remarks, and reproducing the same ideas, frequently attended by the same phraseology. It seems, indeed, as if when he had once possessed himself of a moral sentiment, or a philosophical induction, or an historical decision, or a peculiar notion, he deems that he cannot too often bring it before the eyes of his readers. And this is the more strange, because there is no lack of sterling matter or sound sense in the book; and yet we are pestered, actually pestered, with the recurrence of certain trains of thought and modes of expression, whenever they suggest themselves to the author's mind.

For example, we are told in the outset that both Marlborough and Berwick derived their military talents from Sir Francis Drake; which suggests the very just observation, that military talents, as well as all other moral and mental faculties, are transmissible through females. Well, the fact is interesting, the deduction just, the principle important. But we own to considerable restlessness, when we find the same fact, deduction, and principle, repeated over and over again, at least six, and perhaps a dozen times in the course of the two volumes.

He also very much encumbers his periods, at times, by the introduction of certain historical characters of other ages (amongst which Cæsar, Alexander, Napoleon, and Wellington stand pre-eminent), by way of illustration or comparison. And in some instances devotes whole paragraphs, unnecessarily, and, it must be added, wearisomely, to such comparisons or remarks.

Again, a total absence, and, as it appears, an entire ignorance, of Church principles, leads our author into some strange blunders.

"In truth," says he, "the Romish is essentially, and of necessity, a persecuting and intolerant establishment."—Vol. i. p. 61.

So far, so good. We cordially agree in this statement, though the word "establishment" is decidedly infelicitous. But what does the reader suppose to be the cause assigned by Mr. Alison for this persecuting character?

"As it acknowledges only one faith, and regards all others as heresies, it *must* consider it as the first of sacred duties to extinguish them. Looking upon heresy and schism as crimes equal in dye to murder and robbery, and far more dangerous in their effects, it of necessity holds it equally a political and social obligation to crush them by the arm of the civil power, and by all the terrors of the most inhuman punishments."—Vol. i. p. 61.

We had an idea that there existed a passage in a writer, whom Mr. Alison would acknowledge as an authority in such matters, which speaks of ONE FAITH in juxta-position with ONE GOD, as being of equal importance to the Christian life. We imagined, too, that a still higher AUTHORITY had laid down the law, "*He that believeth not shall be damned*;" and yet, to the best of our recollection, the early professors of that ONE FAITH had been taught, and acted too upon the lesson, "*Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good*."

This striking defect in Mr. Alison's education accounts—yet scarcely accounts—for such passages as the following:—

"The onset of the Church of Rome against that of Luther, com-

menced in both countries (*i.e.* France and Great Britain) about the same time. In 1685, the Edict of Nantes was revoked by Louis XIV. In 1687, the persecution of the Protestants, and measures evidently designed for the re-establishment of the Romish faith, commenced in Great Britain."—Vol. i. p. 35.

We need scarcely remind our readers, that neither of the parties against whom persecution was either practised or intended were *Lutherans* at all.

In a similar spirit, Popery is called "the ancient faith," and James II. designated as "a devout and daring Catholic." We need not, therefore, wonder at the inadequate portraiture of our "good Queen Anne," which these volumes display; but we own to a certain degree of astonishment, when we find Austria described as actuated by zeal for the Protestant faith; and Eugene and his soldiers, as animated by religious enthusiasm in the same cause. Thus we read:—

"Europe was permanently divided by these great events. The wrongs committed, the injuries suffered on both sides, were too great to be forgiven. On the one was a throne overturned, a race of sovereigns in exile; on the other, were half a million of persecuted human beings wandering in foreign lands. Temporal wrongs of the deepest dye had come to be superadded to religious divisions. Alliances on both parts followed, and revealed the vehement passions which were felt. The league of Augsburg, first signed on 9th July, 1686, united Austria, Spain, Holland, Saxony, Swabia; to which, after the Revolution of 1688, was added England, against France: . . . and but for the desertion of the alliance by England, at the peace of Utrecht, the allies might have given law in the palace of the Grand Monarque, bridled the tyranny of Bossuet and Tellier, and permanently established the Protestant faith in nearly the half of Europe."—Vol. i. pp. 36, 37. 66.

There is, moreover, another point upon which our highly-talented author exhibits a lamentable confusion of ideas—he considers honourable love and illicit passion as identical in their nature, and only distinguished by their subjects and objects:—

"It is in love," says he, "that the real disposition appears. The master-passion does not alter, it only *brings out*, the human heart. It presents with greater force, and exhibits in clearer light, the ruling dispositions; but it alters none of them. Hence the extraordinary difference in the effects it produces; and hence it is that one set of writers exhibit it as the most elevating and ennobling, another as the most dangerous and self-magnifying, passion which can impel the human soul. Both are right; the difference lies, and that is immense, in the souls which are impelled. Love only magnifies their ruling qualities as they existed before it was felt. It renders the noble more noble, the brave more brave, the generous more generous, the self-denying more

self-denying; but it also renders not less certainly the base more base, the cowardly more cowardly, the selfish more selfish, the rapacious more rapacious. It leads one to sacrifice himself for his beloved, it causes another to sacrifice his beloved to himself: it induces in one the death of a hero, in another the life of a seducer."—Vol. i. pp. 63, 64.

On another occasion, after quoting a very interesting and touching passage from one of Marlborough's letters to his countess, he observes:—

"It is of the nature of heroic and noble characters to be secretly influenced, often through the whole of life, by the romantic and impassioned sentiments of this description. We see this in Cæsar, in Pompey, in Henry IV., in Nelson, in Marquis Wellesley, in Mark Anthony; but how seldom are they united, with the strictest attention, to domestic duties, and exhale not in passionate addresses to an adored mistress, but, as with Marlborough and Edward I. of England, in tender and affectionate effusions to a beloved wife!"—Vol. i. p. 91, note.

Mr. Alison might with equal justice say, that it was quite wrong to suppose that the religion of St. John the Divine differed intrinsically from that of the Hebrew apostates, who offered their children unto Moloch; or the Canaanites, who practised unto their idols every abomination that the Lord hateth; he might argue that Bishop Ken, when feeding the Puritan rebels who had defaced his cathedral, was actuated by the same motive which induced Louis XIV. to break the Huguenots on the wheel; nay, he might go further, and solemnly aver his conviction, that there was no real difference between angels of light and darkness, except that by the merest possible chance, the one class were located in Heaven, and the other in Hell. But enough of this.

And now having pointed out the principal faults of this masterly production, we will delay no longer on the threshold of our theme, but plunge at once *in medias res*, and reserve our farther strictures, as well as commendations, for the occasions which elicit them.

"John Churchill," says his biographer, "afterwards Duke of Marlborough, was born on the 5th July, 1650 (new style), at Ash, in the county of Devon. His father was Sir Winston Churchill, a gallant cavalier, who had drawn his sword in behalf of Charles I., and had in consequence been deprived of his fortune, and driven into exile by Cromwell. His paternal family was very ancient, and boasted its descent from the *Courcils* de Poitou, who came into England with the Conqueror."—Vol. i. p. 1.

On his mother's side, as we have already remarked, he was descended from Sir Francis Drake. His earlier career, however, though distinguished by those brilliant talents which were in

later years the instruments by which Providence conferred solid benefits on his country, and undying glory on himself, was disgraced by too much of that meanness and profligacy, which more or less characterize almost every public man, who figured on the political stage during the contest of the great Revolution, and the periods immediately preceding and following that celebrated convulsion. His introduction to court was the result of his sister's shame, as well as his father's services—his steady patron was that sister's seducer, James, successively Duke of York and King of England; and from an intrigue with a paramour of that prince's brother, he obtained the sum of 5000*l.*, by the prudent investment of which, he laid the foundation of his fortunes!

We are tempted at the first thought of these things to throw aside the subject in disgust—we feel convinced, ere we enter on the investigation, that such a man must deserve all the invectives so unsparingly heaped upon his head by Miss Strickland and Mr. Macaulay, not to mention earlier writers—we are ready to offer the strongest asseverations, that such a wretch shall never excite our admiration, much less enlist our sympathy: and when, as we advance in our examination, we find him, after a course of brilliant success and unruffled prosperity, turn upon his benefactor in his hour of need, sting the hand that had fed him, and dethrone the monarch to whose profligate partiality he owed his entrance into life, and whose constant kindness had raised him to rank and power, we feel our anger kindle, our disgust heighten, till both reach a climax when the triumphant traitor enters into treasonable correspondence with the enemies of his country, and wavers in double-minded treason between the old master whom he had deserted, and the new master he is willing to betray.

And yet this is the great Duke of Marlborough! and, stranger still, he forces, he seizes, he obtains, he holds, and he *deserves*, not only our ardent admiration, but also our sincere esteem.

The reader will ask how this is possible. We will endeavour to answer him.

There are periods in the history of nations, and the era of the English Revolution is one of them, when all that is base, and vile, and mean, and foul, riots in unbounded luxuriance, and when all that is noble, and honourable, and lofty, and pure, droops and withers. It is not too much to say, that, with the exception of the seraphic Ken and his brethren in persecution—in double persecution from an iron tyranny and a despotic rebellion—there was not one solitary man engaged with public affairs, whose conduct, either private or public, merits exemption from the stern censure of the moralist. It is a period which it actually disgusts one to contemplate; like some vast flat deserted by the receding

ocean, and disclosing to our view the corrupting carcasses of shipwrecked mariners, sad trophies of the fury of the storm.

There are circumstances too, associations, and necessities, which try and taint the noblest; and it is well for those who have not been submitted to their influence to be cautious, as well as candid, in their sentence upon the victims of such contingencies.

“ He knew the human heart well, who commanded us in our daily prayers to supplicate not to be led into temptation, even before asking for deliverance from evil¹. ”

Our opinion then of Marlborough's conduct is this: endowed by nature with a commanding form, a handsome countenance, and a resistless address—gifted with talents suited alike for the highest commands in peace or war, and calculated to achieve the greatest exploits in either the court, the council, the senate, or the field—imbued from his earliest years with a deep and sincere devotion to the Church and the Faith of his fathers—a strong attachment to his sovereign, and an entire love of his country—and adding to all these high excellencies and great advantages a warm heart and a kindly disposition, JOHN CHURCHILL was reared in an atmosphere of pollution—and subjected from youth till manhood to every association which could debase, to every temptation which could mislead, to every force which could impair or destroy his noble nature—but his nature was noble; and, after rising through the sewer of pollution into the fetid atmosphere of a corrupt court, and slowly disengaging himself from the foul vapours into which he had emerged—with glancing eye and wing that never tired, he sped his course of glory through his native sky, leaving the filthy harpies and other obscene birds of his early association to marvel at and revile his eagle flight.

In the matter of deserting James, we are fully persuaded that, however basely he acted, his conduct was the result of fidelity to his Church and his country; we believe that he felt it his duty, after having vainly warned his infatuated master, to prefer the triumph of public principles to the suggestions of personal feeling or the calls of private obligation.

After the downfall of James, he became disgusted with the sternness of William; and, partly from this natural revulsion of feeling, partly from a relenting tenderness towards his former patron, was guilty of that weak vacillation and those treasonable acts which cast a shadow over his dawning glory.

The hour, however, of doubt was but of short duration, and from that time forth he devoted all the energies of his mighty

¹ Vol. i. p. 18.

mind,—all the graces of his attractive person,—all that he had, or could, or was,—to the single-hearted, self-devoted advancement of his country's good and his country's glory.

Before, however, considering that high course of undying renown, we must summon to the platform some of those distinguished personages whose character and conduct had an influence upon the fame and fortunes of the Duke of Marlborough.

And, first, we summon to the bar his great antagonist, the mightiest monarch, and, if we except his conqueror, the greatest man, of the age—the able statesman—the consummate courtier—the graceful host—the gallant soldier—the devout debauchee—the pitiless persecutor—Louis XIV. of France. Never has the Church of Rome, prolific though she be in sanguinary saints and pious profligates,—never has his native land, fruitful alike in folly and in vice, in grace and gallantry,—never has the race of Bourbon, distinguished for its continuous and intense realization, its constant and multiform development of “the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,”—produced such a transcendent example of accursed glory as in the case of him, whom succeeding ages as well as his own time dignified with the title of “*Le Grand Monarque*.”

We summon this exalted culprit first, because he was the *primum mobile*, as it were, of the whole course of events which, moved onwards by his boundless ambition and vast abilities, his bigotry, his cruelty, his wilfulness, and his falsehood, at length culminated in the war of the Spanish succession.

“That he was a great man, as well as a successful sovereign, is decisively demonstrated by the mighty changes which he effected in his own realm, as well as in the neighbouring states of Europe. When he ascended the throne, France, though it contained the elements of greatness, had not yet become great. It had been alternately wasted by the ravages of the English, and torn by the fury of the religious wars. The insurrection of the Fronde had shortly before involved the capital in all the horrors of a civil conflict: barricades had been erected in the streets, alternate victory and defeat had by turns elevated and depressed the rival factions. . . . Never had the monarchy been depressed to a greater pitch of weakness than during the reign of Louis XIII. and the minority of Louis XIV. But from the time that the latter ascended the throne, order seemed to arise out of chaos. The ascendancy of a great mind—as in India, when Marquis Wellesley assumed the government—soon made itself felt in every department. Civil war ceased; rival factions disappeared; even the bitterness of religious hatred seemed for a time to be stilled by the influence of patriotic feeling. The energies of France drawn forth during the agonies of civil conflict were turned to public objects and the career of national aggrandizement. . . . From a pitiable state of anarchy that glorious realm at once appeared on the

theatre of Europe great, powerful, and united. It is no common capacity which can thus seize the helm and right the ship when it is reeling most violently, and the fury of contending elements has all but torn it in pieces. It is the highest proof of political capacity to discern the bent of the public mind when most strongly excited, and, by falling in with the prevailing desire of the majority, to convert the desolating vehemence of social conflict into the steady passion for national advancement. . . . It was because his character and turn of mind coincided with the national desires, at the moment of his ascending the throne, that this great monarch was enabled to achieve this marvellous transformation. . . . The feudal spirit, modified but not destroyed by the changes of time, appeared to be concentrated with its highest lustre in his person. He was still the head of the Franks: the lustre of the historic families yet surrounded his throne; but he was the head of the Franks only,—that is, of a hundred and fifty thousand conquering warriors. Twenty millions of conquered Gauls were no further considered in his administration than in so far as they augmented the national strength or added to the national resources. But this distinction was then neither perceived nor regarded. Worn out with civil dissension, torn to pieces by religious passions, the fervent minds and restless ambition of the French longed for a *national* field for exertion, an arena in which social dissensions might be forgotten. Louis XIV. gave them this field: he opened this arena; he ascended the throne at the time when this desire had become so strong and general as in a manner to concentrate on its objects the national will. His character, equally in all its parts, was adapted to the ~~general~~ want. He took the lead alike in the greatness and the foibles of his subjects. Were they ambitious?—so was he; were they desirous of renown?—so was he; were they desirous of protection to industry?—so was he; were they prone to gallantry?—so was he. His figure stately, and countenance majestic; his manner lofty and commanding; his conversation dignified, but enlightened; his spirit ardent, but patriotic: he was thus qualified to take the lead and preserve his ascendancy among a proud body of ancient nobles whom the disasters of preceding reigns and the astute policy of Cardinal Richelieu had driven into the ante-chambers of Paris, but who preserved in their ideas and habits the pride and recollections of the conquerors who followed the banners of Clovis. And the great body of the people—proud of their sovereign, proud of his victories, proud of his magnificence, proud of his fame, proud of his national spirit, proud of the literary glory which environed his throne, in secret proud of his gallantries,—joyfully followed their nobles in the brilliant career which his ambition opened, and submitted to his government with as much docility as they had once ranged themselves round the banners of their respective chiefs on the day of battle.”—Vol. i. pp. 51—54.

We need not dwell upon the clearness of conception and the propriety of expression which characterize these pages. Mr. Ali-

son has seized upon all the prominent characteristics of the portrait, and delineated with equal accuracy and skill the minor portions of his picture. The great feature, however, of Louis's character,—that which put the seal upon his greatness,—that which enabled him to raise and to leave behind him a monument of lasting renown,—whilst at the same time it engaged him in that fatal crime which sealed his doom,—is thus ably depicted by our author.

“Louis XIV. was essentially monarchical. That was the secret of his success; it was because he first gave the powers of *unity* to the monarchy, that he rendered France so brilliant and powerful. All his changes, and they were many, from the dress of soldiers to the instructions to ambassadors, were characterized by the same spirit. He first introduced a *uniform* in the army. Before his time the soldiers merely wore a *banderole* over their steel breastplates, and ordinary dresses. That was a great and symptomatic improvement; it at once induced an *esprit de corps*, and a sense of responsibility. He first made the troops march with a measured step, and caused large bodies of men to move with the precision of a single company. The artillery and engineer service, under his auspices, made astonishing progress. Never was a man who more thoroughly possessed that quality, invaluable in a sovereign, which discerns, and at once selects, ability in the public service. Here no prejudice misled, no jealousy arrested, no partiality blinded him. His discriminating eye selected the genius of Vauban, which invented, as it were, the modern system of fortification, and well nigh brought it to its greatest elevation, and raised to the highest command that of Turenne, which carried the military art to the most consummate perfection. Skilfully turning the martial and enterprizing genius of the Franks into the career of conquest, he multiplied tenfold their power, by conferring on them the inestimable advantages of skilled discipline and unity of action. He gathered the feudal array around his banner; he roused the ancient barons from their chateaux, the old retainers from their villages. But he arranged them in disciplined battalions of regular troops, who received the pay and obeyed the orders of government, and never left their colours. His regular army was all enrolled by voluntary enlistment, and served for pay. The militia alone was raised by conscription. . . . The same unity which the genius of Louis and his minister communicated to the military power of France, he gave also to its naval forces and internal strength. To such a pitch of greatness did he raise the marine of the monarchy, that it all but outnumbered that of England: and the battle of La Hogue, in 1692, alone determined, as Trafalgar did a century after, to which of these rival powers the dominion of the seas was to belong. His ordinances of the marine, promulgated in 1681, form the best code of maritime law yet known, and one which is still referred to . . . as a ruling authority in all commercial states. He introduced astonishing reforms into the courts of law; and to his efforts the great perfection of

the French law, as it now appears in the admirable works of Pothier, is in a great degree to be ascribed. He reduced the government of the interior to that regular and methodical system of governors of provinces, mayors of cities, and other subordinate authorities, all receiving their instructions from the Tuileries, which under no subsequent change of government, imperial or royal, has been abandoned, and which has in every succeeding age formed the main source of its strength.
“He arrayed the scholars, philosophers, and poets of his dominions, like soldiers and sailors; almost all the academies of France, which have since become so famous, were of his institution: he sought to give discipline to thought as he had done to his fleets and armies, and rewarded successive literary efforts not less than warlike achievements. No monarch ever knew better the magical influence of intellectual strength on general opinion, or felt more strongly the expedience of enlisting it on the side of authority; he aimed at drawing not over his own country alone, but over the whole of Europe, the meshes of regulated and centralized thought. The religious persecution, which constitutes the great blot on his reign, and caused its brilliant career to close in mourning, was the result of the same desire. He longed to give the same unity to the Church which he had done to the army, navy, and civil strength of the monarchy. He saw no reason why the Huguenots should not, at the royal command, face about like one of Turenne's battalions. Schism in the Church was viewed by him in exactly the same light as rebellion in the state. No efforts were spared by inducements, good deeds, and fair promises, to make proselytes; but when 1,200,000 Protestants resisted his seductions, the sword, the faggot, and the wheel were resorted to without mercy for their destruction.”—Vol. i. pp. 55—58.

Yes, the despot knew right well that civil and religious liberty must live and die together. The life of the one involves that of the other: no nation is really free, even in a civil point of view, whose *thoughts* are subject to the control of the civil power; no nation will long continue in a state of absolute slavery which does possess freedom of thought. For thoughts naturally lead to their own expression in words, their own expansion in deeds; and liberty of conscience prepares the mind for liberty of action.

It was not then from a single-hearted devotion to the errors and claims of his false creed and faithless Church, that this amiable Nero devoted men to torture and women to infamy, outdoing in extent as well as atrocity the foulest and fiercest persecutions of Pagan Rome. No! though lawless lust and gloomy idolatry struggled in his heart for dominion, SELF was the Jove of his Ida, the Lord of his soul; his rule, his standard, his motive, his end, his god. By a fearful accumulation, and, as it were, amalgamation of evils, he combined the most unrelenting fanaticism with the most intense selfishness; and thus, when

men were burned, and children butchered, and women violated *by his orders*, it is difficult to say whether the sacrifice were offered by Louis the sovereign or Louis the saint.

Mr. Alison speaks with a criminal mildness of the licentiousness of this man, and even, we regret to say, attempts to gloss over his heartless profligacy by a pitiable sentimentalism. Nay, he is so far dazzled by the halo of glory which surrounds the *Grand Monarque*, that he is far too lenient to his many faults; in fact, he views in him a hero, and, like the generality of the world, is tempted to kneel down and worship him.

The following remarks, however, are worthy of all consideration: they are written in the spirit in which an Englishman ought to write, and in which he will write, unless he be a Romanist or a Romanizer.

“The expulsion of 400,000 innocent human beings from their country, for no other cause but difference of religious opinion; the destruction of nearly 100,000, of whom, it is said, a tenth perished by the frightful tortures of the wheel and the stake; the wholesale desolation of provinces and destruction of cities, for conscience sake, never will, and never should be forgotten. It is the eternal disgrace of the Roman Catholic religion—a disgrace to which the ‘execrations of ages have not yet affixed an adequate censure’—that all these infamous State crimes took their origin in the bigoted zeal, or sanguinary ambition of the Church of Rome.”—Vol. i. p. 61.

With a candour, the more generous because it is not the result of any mawkish sentimentalism or spurious liberality, or hidden hankering after either the creed, or the principles of the exiled prince, Mr. Alison has done justice to the high qualities and great abilities of one, whom succeeding generations have heaped with that cowardly abuse which is generally allotted to the last of a fallen dynasty.

“James II.,” says he, “was not destitute of abilities, and he was actuated by that sincerity of intention and earnestness of purpose, which is so important an element in every elevated character. . . . James was not without his personal frailties as well as Charles, but they did not form a ruling part of his character. Cast in a ruder mould, moved by more serious feelings, he was actuated in every period of life by lofty and respectable, because generous and disinterested, passions. Patriotism at first was his ruling motive—England had not a more gallant admiral; and in his combats with De Ruyter and Van Tromp, he exhibited a degree of nautical skill rarely witnessed in those who have been bred in palaces. Nelson or Collingwood did not more gallantly steer into the midst of the enemy’s fleet, or engage with more dogged resolution, yard-arm to yard-arm, with a powerful and redoubtable foe. Nor was he without capacity in the direction of such com-

bats; and the system of naval tactics which he introduced was followed for above a hundred years in the British navy, till, in the confidence of superior prowess in combating an inferior foe, it was superseded by the breaking of the line introduced by Rodney in 1784. In one of these great battles with the Dutch, under De Ruyter, he fought with forty ships of the line against seventy; and so desperate was the fight, that though the English were in the end victorious, James was obliged three times to change his ship, and hoist his flag on another, from the former having become disabled in the fight. But this spirit of gallantry, which led to such glorious deeds when he was lord high admiral, only precipitated his ruin. He thought he could direct the nation as he had done his ships of the line. When he ascended the throne, this daring and obstinate disposition was entirely directed towards religion. The interest of James in the navy, and his efforts for augmenting its strength and increasing its efficiency, were not terminated with his accession to the throne. He was a thorough man of business, and frugal in his habits; and the permanent revenue of the crown was five times what it had been in the time of Charles I., so that he was enabled, without incurring debt, or having recourse to arbitrary or illegal exactions, to replenish the dockyards, and put the navy into the most respectable condition. He was indefatigable in his efforts to attain these objects; and such was the practical acquaintance with ship-building and nautical details of which he was possessed, that he was enabled to detect all the abuses in the dockyards which had hitherto eluded observation or defied reformation, and direct all the public funds set apart for that service to the real purposes of the state. Mr. Macaulay, no partial panegyrist of James, has told us that he effected these reforms because 'he was the only honest man in his dockyards.' Several hours of personal and close attention were devoted every day to this important branch of the public service, and the effects which attended his exertions were immense. It was mainly owing to his efforts and patriotic perseverance that the navy of England was put on a footing commensurate with the commercial necessities and political importance of the state, and the fleet equipped, which, four years after he had been expelled from the throne, broke the naval power of France at La Hogue, and determined for above a century the maritime contest between France and England."—Vol. i. pp. 71—74.

Such were some of the high qualities of one whom history has hardly dealt with, such the benefits which he conferred upon that country which has unceasingly and almost unmixedly vituperated his memory. His high qualities and capacities were the gifts with which God had graciously furnished him, that he might be enabled to do his duty in that state of life to which it had pleased Him to call him. His faults and his fall were owing to his having deserted the English Church for the Roman schism, and turned the truth of God into a lie.

We have already mentioned the early obligations of Marlbo-

rough to this unfortunate prince : his course under his successor was also with some alternations one of prosperity and renown :—

“ If ever,” says Mr. Alison, “ the characters of two important actors on the theatre of human affairs stood forth in striking and emphatic contrast to each other, they were those of Louis XIV. and William III. The result of their contest proved the prodigious difference in the resources of the parties, and affords the clearest illustration of the persevering and indomitable character of William. Sunk in obscure marshes, cooped up in a narrow territory, driven into a corner of Europe, the forces at his command appeared as nothing before the stupendous array of his adversary. Down went town and tower before the apparition of Louis in his strength. The iron barriers of Flanders yielded almost without a struggle to his arms. The genius of Turenne and Vauban, the presence of Louis, proved for the time irresistible. The Rhine was crossed ; fifty thousand men appeared before the gates of Amsterdam. Dissension had paralysed its strength, terror all but mastered its resolution. England, influenced by French mistresses, bought by French gold, in secret won over to the French faith, held back, and ere long openly joined the oppressor, alike of its liberties and its religion. All seemed lost for the liberties of Europe and the Protestant faith. But William was not dismayed. He had a certain resource against subjugation left. In his own words, ‘ he could die in the last ditch.’ He communicated his unconquerable spirit to his fainting fellow-citizens ; he inspired them with the noble resolution to abandon their own country, rather than submit to the invaders, and ‘ seek in a new hemisphere that liberty of which Europe had become unworthy.’ The generous effort was not made in vain. The Dutch rallied round a leader who was not wanting to himself in such a crisis. The dikes were cut ; the labour of centuries was lost ; the ocean resumed its sway over the fields reft from its domain. But the cause of freedom, of religion was gained.

“ Like many other men who are called on to play an important part in the affairs of the world, William seemed formed by nature for the duties he was destined to perform. Had his mind been stamped by a different die, his character cast in a different mould, he would have failed in his mission. He was not a monarch of the most brilliant, or a general of the most daring kind. Had he been either the one or the other, he would have been shattered against the colossal strength of Louis XIV., and crushed in the very outset of his career. But he possessed in the highest perfection that great quality without which, in the hour of trial, all others prove of no avail—moral courage and invincible determination He was perseverance itself. Nothing could shake his resolution, nothing divert his purpose. With equal energy he laboured in the cabinet to construct and keep together the vast alliance necessary to restrain the ambition of the French monarch, and toiled in the field to baffle the enterprises of his able generals.”—Vol. i. pp. 65—67.

We will not pause to recount the many heroic achievements, or point out the many faults, *and they are many*, in the public as well as the private character of this able statesman and gallant soldier. Rather let us pass on to a more pleasing portrait, that of his gentle sister-in-law, our own Queen Anne.

Is it want of penetration or of patriotism, of gallantry or of Churchmanship, that has arrayed such a vast and motley host of assailants against the last of the Stuarts, and prevented a single champion of note or of name from entering the lists in her favour? We know not; but we are sorely perplexed and distressed that such should be the present state of affairs; and, albeit against the heavy arms and practised skill of warriors equal in prowess to either Front-de-Bœuf or Bois-Guilbert; nay, though a maiden cavalier like the fabled Clorinda have entered the lists upon the other side, will we attempt to do battle for the kindest and the truest heart that moulders amid the dust of England's sovereigns.

True, she had not the interesting weakness or fanatical bigotry (whichever way we like to view her character) of the first-born of Henry VIII., nor the consummate craft and glittering heartlessness of her younger sister: she did not persecute the Church with Mary, nor make it a mask for her own policy with Elizabeth.

True, that, unlike Mary of Orange, she was "every inch a queen," and that she was yet every inch a woman. True, that she had not that comfortable feeling of self-applauding self-righteousness which is so generally regarded as a proof of the highest moral rectitude; that she had more than once grave scruples of conscience; and, that, instead of believing herself to be either infallible or impeccable, she felt and acknowledged too that she was one of a race born in sin and the children of wrath, and claimed no exemption from that fault or infection of our nature which doth remain yea even in the regenerate. True, that she was wanting in that intense selfishness and transcendent ability which enabled George IV. to free himself, without a struggle or a pang, from the trammels of habit and affection, and, single-handed, conduct to a successful issue a contest with a banded world.

True, that, though deserting her father in the day of his distress, under the firm conviction that she was only heeding the solemn warnings—"Whoso loveth father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me;" "*If any man come to Me and hate not his father and mother he cannot be My disciple:*"—she still cherished a relenting tenderness towards him whom she had been in the habit of honouring next after her God; and, much as she loved her God and the people whom He had committed to her charge, felt a reluctance amounting to aversion against the thought

of disinheriting her only brother in favour of a stranger and an alien in blood and in religion. True, above all, that, whilst abhorring the cruelties, and loathing the corruptions, and denying the errors, and defying the claims, of Rome, she was "a sincere and devout Catholic," in the true sense of that much profaned phrase, loving the doctrine and discipline, the liturgy, articles, and homilies of her own pure Church, and meekly studying and striving to shape her life and conversation in accordance with, and obedience to, the Word of God.

But all these charges—and they have been all urged against her with keen acrimony, and earnest-hearted malice, and eloquent virulence—are, in our opinion, matters of commendation. A loving wife, a devoted mother, a zealous friend, a faithful child of the Church, a single-hearted defender of the Faith, a consistent professor of the Gospel, a sincere lover of her Saviour, a humble-minded servant of her God,—such was our own Queen Anne. Nor should we forget, whilst summing up her long list of almost unexampled excellencies, that she was, in the highest, and truest, and noblest senses of those *holy* words—a woman, an English woman, and a patriot Queen.

But let us return to our hero:—

"One of the most interesting and instructive lessons," remarks Mr. Alison, "to be learned from biography, is derived from observing the long steps, the vast amount of previous preparation, the numerous changes—some prosperous, others adverse—by which the powers of a great man are formed, and he is prepared for playing the important part which it is intended he should perform on the theatre of the world. Providence does nothing in vain; and when it has selected a particular mind for a great achievement, the events which happen to it all seem to conspire in a mysterious way for its development. Were any one omitted, some essential quality in the character of the future hero, statesman, or philosopher, would be found wanting."—Vol. i. p. 7.

Thus was it that the expedition to Tangier, in 1666, gave him an introduction to actual warfare at the early age of sixteen. Thus, by a singular coincidence, it was in the Flemish campaigns of Louis XIV., under Turenne, Condè, and Vauban, that the future conqueror of the Bourbons first learnt the strategic art. During the five years in which he served with the auxiliary force furnished by England to the French king, Churchill gained knowledge and experience, as well as universal good will and high renown. In 1677 he returned to England. In 1678 he married the celebrated Sarah Jennings, so famous in after history as the violent, rapacious, and overbearing Duchess of Marlborough. His sincere, intense, and unvarying attachment to this highly-

talented and very beautiful woman, is one of the many private traits of character which at once relieve and augment the splendour of his public renown. Shortly after his marriage he obtained a regiment.

“ This alliance increased his influence, already great with the Duke of York, and laid the foundation of the future grandeur of his fortunes. Shortly after his marriage, he was sent on a mission of peculiar delicacy to William, Stadtholder of Holland, who had recently before married Mary, daughter of that prince. He was afterwards employed on various diplomatic missions, for which his elegant manners and great address peculiarly qualified him. Some years after he accompanied the Duke of York to Holland, where he remained for some time. . . . On their return to London, in 1682, Churchill was presented by his patron to the king, who made him colonel of the third regiment of Guards. When the Duke of York ascended the throne in 1685, on the demise of his brother, Churchill kept his place as one of the gentlemen of the bedchamber, and was raised to the rank of brigadier-general. He was sent to Paris, to notify his sovereign's accession to Louis XIV.; and on his return he was created a peer, by the title of Baron Churchill of Landbridge, in the county of Hertford—a title which he took from an estate there which he had acquired in right of his wife.”—Vol. i. pp. 10, 11.

Churchill's fame and prosperity received a further accession from the military ability which he manifested, and the essential services which he rendered to the throne during Monmouth's invasion. Of his conduct at the period of the Revolution we have already spoken, and must refer our readers for further particulars connected with that transaction, and the events that followed, to the lucid pages of Mr. Alison's work. During the reign of William, the constant and faithful service rendered by him and his wife to the Princess Anne, gave them both a strong claim on her gratitude, and a strong hold on her affections; and on her accession to the throne, in 1702, their influence was proportionably felt both at home and abroad.

The vast and various abilities of Churchill were now employed in forming, cementing, preserving, and conducting the Grand Alliance against France—the avowed object of which was to dispossess the Bourbons of the vast dominions devised by Charles II. of Spain to the Duke of Anjou—and to place an Austrian prince on the Spanish throne. His difficulties were as many as the talents by which he surmounted them. At home was a Tory cabal desirous of peace with France; and a Whig faction ravening for the undivided enjoyment of place, pelf, and power. Abroad were the various selfish and discordant interests of the allies, each ready to sacrifice the common cause to their own individual advantage; each

jealous of the achievements and the intentions and the influence of the rest. Yet Marlborough, as we shall call him by anticipation, united these jarring elements, controlled these rival impulses, moulded this heterogeneous mass to his will ; and in spite of all that the selfishness of unprincipled factions could do at home, or the perverseness of refractory cabinets could effect abroad—in spite of the sordid selfishness of his Whig co-adjutors, the unprincipled baseness of his Tory supplanters—the vacillation of the Northern courts—the distraction of the emperor—the unutterable meanness of the Dutch councils—and the execrable cowardice of the Dutch deputies—succeeded in saving Europe from the arms of France ; humbling in the dust the ablest and proudest monarch that the house of Capet has ever given to her throne ; exalting his native land to a high place amongst the kingdoms of the earth, and establishing her freedom and her power upon a basis which has never since been shaken.

“ Marlborough's first mission to the Continent, after the accession of Anne, was of a diplomatic character ; and it was by his unwearied efforts, suavity of manner, and singular talents for negotiation, that the difficulties which attend the formation of all such extensive confederacies were overcome. . . . He arrived at the Hague on the 28th of March, and left it to attend the obsequies of William on the 5th of April ; but during that short period all obstacles were adjusted, and the conditions of the alliance finally arranged.”—Vol. i. p. 83.

“ But it was not in foreign negotiations alone that the great civil and political talents of Marlborough proved at this juncture of the most essential service to Europe. Queen Anne, at her accession to the throne, was deeply imbued with the prejudices, in ordinary circumstances not unreasonable, of the Tories against foreign connexions. Her cabinet was composed almost entirely of men of that party, inasmuch that Marlborough, when urging his friend Godolphin to accept the important situation of lord-treasurer—corresponding to our first lord of the treasury—on the formation of the cabinet, used as his main argument, that ‘ unless he took that office he could not hold the command of the armies, as he could rely on no one else to provide the requisite supplies.’ But although the obvious danger to the independence of the country, from the union of the strength of France and Spain in the person of so able and ambitious a monarch as Louis XIV., rendered it a matter of necessity for the Tory majority in the cabinet to go into measures for the defence of Europe, yet they were inclined to do so in the most economical manner, and on the smallest possible scale, a policy which would have proved altogether fatal to the common cause, and rendered the war productive only of expense, defeat, and disaster. Marlborough, who clearly discerned that England was the soul of the Grand Alliance, and that, unless she came forward in a manner worthy of her strength and renown, all their efforts would prove ineffectual,

exerted himself to the utmost, after his return from the Hague, to combat these ruinous views. He represented that to desert the alliance concluded by the late king would be to dishonour the nation; that nothing but the whole power of England, joined to that of the allied states on the Continent, could promise it a successful issue; and that the slightest appearance of vacillation in executing the engagements he had recently come under with the States of Holland, would alienate the powers with whom we were united, and lead to the dissolution of the Grand Alliance. These arguments, recommended alike by their intrinsic weight, the eloquence and address of Marlborough, and his known influence with the queen, proved successful. A majority of the cabinet came over to his views; war was proclaimed against France, on the 4th of May, at London, the Hague, and Vienna; and the British cabinet took the most energetic steps to prosecute it with vigour, and execute its engagements with exemplary fidelity."—Vol. i. pp. 84—86.

Another difficulty and dispute arose regarding the choice of a commander-in-chief. The King of Prussia, the Archduke Charles, the Elector of Hanover, and the Duke of Zell, were all equally desirous of obtaining this important post; and, to add to confusion of interests and inclinations, the Queen of England peremptorily required that the office in question should be conferred upon her husband, Prince George of Denmark. The States-general, however—partly from a just estimate of Marlborough's abilities, partly from an apprehension that the Prince-Consort would resist the control of the field-deputies whom they always sent to headquarters to control the commander-in-chief—made a determinate and successful stand for the destined deliverer of Europe.

At the commencement of the contest between the two conflicting parties, on the side of Louis were France, which, with its population of 20,000,000, could maintain 200,000 in arms; and Spain, with its possessions in Flanders; and Italy, besides the islands of Sicily and Sardinia, containing at least 30,000,000: there were also the Spanish colonies beyond sea bringing in a revenue of 5,000,000*l*. Bavaria formed a valuable ally to France. Its geographical position rendered it an important outwork against the confederates; whilst the courage of its inhabitants, their jealousy of the power of Austria, and their firm adhesion to the French interest, gave it an additional value.

The allies possessed the troops of Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, and the lesser states of Germany, Holland, Austria, and England, with slight succour from Prussia and Denmark. The forces on either side were nearly equal, but the French monarch possessed an immense advantage in the unity and secrecy of undivided councils, and in the homogeneous character of the troops commanded by his various generals.

We may not pause to describe the successful campaign of 1702, the siege and fall of Kaiserwörth, Venloo, and Liege, nor enlarge on the moral results of these achievements so ably brought out by Mr. Alison. Nor can we dwell upon the campaign of 1703, in the course of which the mischievous interference of the Dutch deputies twice prevented Marlborough from gaining a decisive and important victory over the enemy.

“But while a certain degree of success had attended the operations of the allies in Flanders, where the English contingent acted and Marlborough had the command, affairs had assumed a very different aspect in Germany and Italy, where the principal efforts of Louis had been made.”—Vol. i. p. 138.

And the year 1704 opened with gloomy prospects:—

“The state of affairs in Germany was melancholy in the extreme. The accession of Portugal and Savoy to the alliance had suspended, not averted, the peril. The advantages of the last campaign had not only made the French masters of the passage of the Rhine, but it had opened to them a passage into the heart of Germany. By the acquisition of Landau and New Brisach, they had secured the means of passing the former; by the alliance with Bavaria they became masters of the most important fortresses in the latter. The Elector of Bavaria had the command of the Danube from its source to the Austrian frontier: he had in his hands Ulm, with a strong garrison, Ratisbon, Augsburg, and he had recently taken Passau and Lintz, the keys of Upper Austria. The French armies only required to force the defiles of the Black Forest, occupied by some thousands of undisciplined peasants, to reach the Elector of Bavaria, who had fixed his head-quarters in the neighbourhood of Ulm, where he was at the head of 45,000 men, whom recent victory had rendered doubly formidable. Louis XIV. had not been slow to take advantage of this auspicious state of affairs; and his generals were prepared, in the very outset of the campaign, to act with the utmost vigour. Besides the army in the Netherlands opposed to Marlborough, Marshal Tallard, with 45,000 men, was posted on the Upper Rhine, ready to co-operate with the advanced body, of equal amount, resting on the Bavarian fortresses, and pour with their united force 90,000 strong down the valley of the Danube, where the Imperialists had neither fortresses nor any adequate force in the field to oppose them. For so entirely was the strength of Austria prostrated by the expenses of the contest, and the formidable nature of the Hungarian insurrection—which had acquired such strength that its leader, Prince Ragotski, was levying contributions to the very gates of Vienna, and had driven his opponent, Schliek, back to Presburg—that they could not collect 20,000 men to cover the western frontier of the Hereditary States, or save the monarchy from ruin.

“The measures of Marlborough, who had concerted the whole plan

of the campaign with Eugene, were calculated to meet these most appalling dangers. He had influence enough with the British cabinet to obtain an addition of 10,000 men to the English contingent, which raised the British native troops in the Low Countries to 30,000 men, and the force under his immediate command to 50,000. He communicated the same impulse to the confederates, having persuaded the Dutch to take 4000 Wirtemberg troops into their pay, and grant a subsidy of 200,000 crowns to the Elector of Baden and the circle of Swabia, to enable their forces to take the field. More difficulty was experienced in getting the States to consent to the proposed measures for the liberation of Germany, as they involved a temporary abandonment of their own frontier; but at length his great influence and engaging manners, joined to the evident peril of the empire, procured a tardy acquiescence in all his proposals. It was agreed that the English general was to advance vigorously against Villeroy in the Low Countries, and force him either to accept battle or retire to the Moselle or the Rhine. In either case, as success was not doubted, he was to cross over into Germany by the Electorate of Cologne, advance as rapidly as possible into Bavaria, and either form a junction with Prince Eugene, who commanded the Imperial army in that quarter, or, by threatening the communications of the French army in Swabia, compel it to fall back to the Rhine. The great object was to save Vienna, and prevent the advance of the French into Hungary, where a few of their regiments might fan the insurrection, already so formidable, into an inextinguishable flame. This plan, by weakening the allies in the Low Countries, might expose them, and especially the Dutch, to disadvantage in that quarter; but that was of little consequence. The vital point was in the valley of the Danube: it was there that the decisive blows were to be struck. Marlborough, in resisting the French invasion, proceeded on exactly the same principles, and showed the same decision of mind, as Napoleon in 1796, when he raised the siege of Mantua to meet the Austrian armies under Wurmser descending from the Tyrol; or Suwarroff in 1799, when he raised that of Turin to march against Macdonald, advancing from Southern Italy towards the fatal field of the Trebbia. In all these measures he received the cordial support of his illustrious colleague, Prince Eugene, who was so far from envying his rival, or joining the clamour raised against him for the unsatisfactory issue of the last campaign, that he said, when the subject was mentioned, 'I suspect, if Alexander the Great had been obliged to await the approbation of the Dutch deputies before he executed his projects, his conquests would not have been quite so rapid as they were.'—Vol. i. pp. 144—147.

Again we must hurry forward, nor do more than allude to Marlborough's cross march into Germany, his first interview with Eugene, his successful attack on the Schellenberg, and the various marches and counter-marches, difficulties and dangers, arrangements and achievements, which preceded and ushered in the day on which the English hero was to win the first of those four

mighty battles which have made his name the pride of his countrymen, and the terror of his country's foes.

“ By the rapidity of his march, which had altogether outstripped the slower movements of Marshal Villeroi, who was still in the neighbourhood of the Moselle, Marlborough had defeated one important part of the combinations of the French king. But if Vendôme, with the Italian army, had succeeded in penetrating through the Tyrol, and joining the French and Bavarian armies to the north of the Alps, their united forces would have greatly preponderated over those of Marlborough and Eugene. On this occasion, however, as subsequently in the wars of 1805 and 1809, the courage and loyalty of the Tyrolese proved the salvation of the Austrian monarchy. These sturdy mountaineers flew to arms; every defile was disputed—every castle required a separate siege. Thus Marshal Tallard and the Elector of Bavaria, were left to make head alone against Prince Eugene and the Duke of Marlborough.”—Vol. i. pp. 158, 159.

The numbers, however, of the French and Bavarians were still superior to those of the allies; as the former had sixty-five thousand men, of whom forty-five thousand were French troops, the very best which the monarchy could produce, besides ninety guns; whereas the latter had about fifty-six thousand men, and only fifty-one guns. A further advantage on the French side was, that four-fifths of their army were national troops, speaking the same language, animated by the same feelings, and accustomed to serve together; whereas the troops under Marlborough's command were a motley assemblage of English, Prussians, Danes, Wirtembergers, Dutch, Hanoverians, and Hessians. The allied army was divided into two *corps d'armée*; the first, commanded by Marlborough in person, which was destined to bear the weight of the contest, and carry the enemy's position in front, being by far the strongest; the second, commanded by Eugene, consisting chiefly of cavalry, and being far smaller in numbers, was intended for a subordinate attack, to distract the enemy's attention from the principal onset.

And here we may observe, as Mr. Alison does, not only here but in many other places, the noble absence of jealousy or rivalry which characterized the intercourse, and cemented the friendship of these two great men. In fact, they were both of them too great, as well as too generous, to be jealous of each other. The loftiest genius alone feels secure in its own high eminence; alone can fully perceive—alone dare fully acknowledge, the lofty genius of another. So is it with wit; so is it with beauty; so is it with every other human endowment. And no higher proof has either left behind of their exceeding greatness, than this their truly noble friendship. But let us return to Mr. Alison, and describe

the battle in his own graphic language. By so doing, we shall, indeed, debar ourselves from that full analysis which we had hoped to give to these volumes: yet we feel that it is due to him, as well as to our readers, to allow him to speak at full length on the subject which is, of all others, nearest and dearest to his heart,—the glory of his country, and the martial prowess of her children.

“ The French position was in places strong, and their disposition for resistance in each point where they were threatened by attack from the allied forces, judicious; but there was a fatal defect in the general conception of their plan. Marshal Tallard was upon the right, resting on the Danube, which secured him from being turned in that quarter, having the village of **BLLENHEIM** in his front, which was strongly garrisoned by twenty-six battalions, and twelve squadrons, all native French troops; and Marsin's flank on the left was secured by a range of rugged steeps, impassable for guns or cavalry, and which therefore rendered any serious attack impossible in that quarter. In the centre was the village of **OBERGLAU**, which was occupied by fourteen battalions, among whom were three Irish corps of celebrated veterans. The rivulets which run along their whole front, and the marshy ground, traversed only by a few roads, all of which were strongly occupied, rendered an attack in front dangerous to the assailants, and certain to be extremely fatal to them. But the weakness lay in the connecting line between the villages, which was kept up only by horse. The communication between **Blenheim** and **Oberglau** was formed of a screen consisting of eighty squadrons, in two lines, having two brigades of foot, consisting of seven battalions, in its centre; and it might have been foreseen that, if the enemy got through the marshes they would not be able to keep their ground. The left opposite **Prince Eugene**, was under the orders of **Marshal Marsin**, and consisted of thirty-eight battalions of infantry and fifty-five squadrons, consisting for the most part of **Bavarians** and **Marshal Marsin's** men, posted in front of the village of **Lutzingen**. Thus the French consisted of eighty-four battalions and a hundred and forty-seven squadrons, with ninety guns; and they mustered sixty thousand combatants,—about five thousand more than the allies, and with a great superiority of artillery. They were posted in a line, strongly supported at each extremity, but weak in the centre, and with the wings where the great body of infantry was placed, at such a distance from each other, that if the centre was broken through, each ran the risk of being enveloped by the enemy, without the other being able to render any assistance. This danger as to the troops in **Blenheim**, the flower of their army, was much augmented by the circumstance, that if their centre was forced when it was formed of cavalry only, and the victors turned sharp round upon **Blenheim**, the horse would be driven headlong into the **Danube**, and the foot in that village would run the hazard of being surrounded or pushed into the river, which was not fordable even for horse at any part. . . . Yet the position

was strong in itself. . . . Both the villages at the extremity of their line had been strengthened, not only with entrenchments hastily thrown up round them, thickly mounted with heavy cannon, but with barricades erected at all their principal entrances, formed of overturned carts, and all the furniture of the houses. . . . The army stood upon a hill or gentle eminence, the guns from which commanded the whole plain by which alone it could be approached. This plain was low, and intersected by a rivulet, which flows down by a gentle descent to the Danube, and near Oberglau unites with two other rivulets, whose united streams flow down past Blenheim into that river. These rivulets had bridges over them at the points where they flowed through the villages; but they were difficult of passage at other points for cavalry and artillery; and with the ditches cut in the swampy meadows through which they flowed, proved no small impediment to the advance of the allied army."—Vol. i. pp. 162—165.

Such was the position occupied by the gallant and highly disciplined army with which the French monarch had determined to assail Austria in her stronghold; to give law to the Empire at the gates of Vienna; and, by the utter humiliation of his great rival, to dissolve the Grand Alliance, lay the whole of continental Europe at his feet, and place once more a vassal king on that island throne which now stood foremost to bear the brunt of his assault, and reply to his threatened invasion by assailing him on his own element.

Fearful was the stake at issue: the importance of the result of that day was known and felt on both sides. The French generals, however, felt certain of victory, whilst the allies were far from sanguine, and many of the officers urged Marlborough to desist. That great man, however, was not to be daunted or damped; victory was necessary to his country,—necessary to that great cause of European freedom which he championed and personified. Delay was dangerous; for succours might soon arrive and increase the numerical superiority of the enemy, or successes might attend the French arms in other quarters, and damage the cause or diminish the courage of the allies.

We proceed in Mr. Alison's words:—

"The Duke of Marlborough, before the action began, visited in person each important battery, in order to ascertain the range of the guns. The troops under his command were drawn up in four lines, the infantry being in front, and the cavalry behind, in each line. This arrangement was adopted in order that the foot soldiers, who would get easiest through the streams, might form on the other side, and cover the formation of the horse, who might be more impeded. The fire of cannon soon became very animated on both sides, and the infantry advanced to the edge of the rivulets with that cheerful air and confident

step which is so often the forerunner of success. On Prince Eugene's side, however, the impediments proved serious: the beds of the rivulets were so broad that they required to be filled up with fascines before they could be passed by the guns; and when they did get across, though they replied, it was without much effect; while the French cannon thundered from the heights, which commanded the whole field. Two thousand men were struck down in all by the French cannon . . . before the allies got over the marshes. At half-past twelve, nevertheless, these difficulties were, by great efforts on the part of Prince Eugene and his wing, overcome, and he sent word to Marlborough that he was ready."—Vol. i. pp. 165, 166.

And how had this breathing time been occupied by the English warrior?—

"During this interval divine service had been performed at the head of every regiment and squadron in the allied army; Marlborough himself had received the sacrament with great solemnity at midnight on the preceding day. So impressed was that great man with religious feelings at that momentous crisis, that after the battle was over he said, he had prayed to God more frequently, during its continuance, than all the chaplains of both armies put together which served under his orders."—Vol. i. p. 166.

It is a solemn, a strange, an awful picture, which these few words suggest. That midnight communion on the eve of battle,—on the brink of the grave,—on the threshold of eternity; that dauntless hero at the dead of night amid the sleeping host, many of whom would sleep a deeper sleep on the morrow, receiving in humble faith and fervent love the sacred symbols of His passion, for the sake of Whose Church and Gospel he had broken every tie of early youth, and with the armies of Whose deadliest foe and cruellest persecutor he was about to engage.

Then, too, that multitudinous host, ere rushing to the deadly conflict, listening with subdued mien, in stillness and in silence, to the solemn prayer slowly, mournfully ascending from earth to heaven! May we not justly entertain the hope that such a service at such a time would reach the hearts of some with whom the Spirit had hitherto vainly striven?

And then that deep consciousness of the omniscience, the omnipresence, the omnipotence of Him who is the Disposer of all things, which pervaded the breast of the great commander as in the midst of the boldest fight he raised the constant prayer to the Lord, the Lord of Hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, and fully realized the truth of that text—"The Lord is a man of war; the Lord is His name."

“He was seated on the ground, in the midst of his staff, eating a slender meal, when Eugene’s aide-de-camp arrived. ‘Now, gentlemen, to your posts!’ said he, with the cheerful voice which betokened the confidence of victory, as he mounted his horse; and his aides-de-camp galloped off in every direction to warn the troops to be ready. Instantly the soldiers every where stood to their arms, and the signal was given to advance. As Marlborough rode along the line, a cannon-ball struck the ground near him, and covered him with earth. All around trembled for the safety of their beloved chief; but he calmly continued his survey as if nothing had happened. The rivulets and marshy ground in front of Blenheim and Unteylau were passed by the first line without much difficulty, though the men were exposed to a heavy fire of artillery from the French batteries; and, the firm ground on the slope being reached, they advanced in the finest order to the attack, the cavalry in front having now defiled to a side, so as to let the English infantry take the lead.

“The French did not expect, and were in a great measure unprepared for an attack, when the heads of the allied columns were seen advancing against them. Their generals had taken up the idea that the enemy were about to retire to Nordlingen, and, as the morning was hazy, the skirmishers of Eugene were close upon them before they were perceived. Alarm-guns were then immediately fired, officers galloped off in every direction, and Tallard and Marsin, hastily mounting their horses, did their utmost to put their troops in proper order. But no plan of defence had been previously arranged; and the troops were hastily thrown into the nearest villages, or such as seemed destined to be first the object of attack. Seven-and-twenty battalions in all were crowded into Blenheim, against which the English column of grenadiers were seen to be steadily advancing. Thirty battalions were posted in and about Oberglau; and Lutzingen was also strongly occupied, while eighteen French and Bavarian battalions were drawn up in an oblique line in the woods in its vicinity, on the extreme left of the cavalry. The guns were judiciously posted along the front of the line, in situations the best calculated to impede the enemy’s advance; and, as they were greatly superior to the artillery of the allies, they played upon their advancing lines with very great effect.”—Vol. i. pp. 165—167.

We wish that we could transfer the whole account of the battle to our pages. Its martial spirit, its graphic power, its lucid narration, are beyond all praise. Suffice it however briefly to say, that the attack gallantly made against the village of Blenheim was repulsed in the first instance with severe loss; that the English general resolved thereupon to bring his whole cavalry across the Nebel, and make a general attack upon the weak part of the enemy’s line between Blenheim and Oberglau. Marshal Tallard, with inconceivable infatuation, allowed the whole first line to be

got over the Nebel before he gave orders to his cavalry to charge them, thus losing the immense advantage which he possessed in the great difficulties attending its passage.

“As it was, a considerable number of the allied horse were driven in disorder across the Nebel. By constantly bringing fresh troops across, however, and judiciously mingling some foot regiments with his horse, Marlborough gradually gained ground; and at length his whole horse, between Blenheim and Oberglau, were got across, and formed in two lines on the opposite side. But meanwhile a serious disaster had occurred on the British right, where Prince Holstein, with his Hanoverians, was directing the attack on Oberglau . . . The Prince's men were utterly routed, he himself taken prisoner, and the centre of the allies entirely broken through . . . But Marlborough was at hand to repair the disaster, and he not only did so, but converted it into an advantage to his own side, which proved decisive . . . By this well-timed vigour affairs were re-established in the centre, and the communication with Prince Eugene was completely recovered.” He then “returned to his cavalry between Oberglau and Blenheim, and found it all firmly established on solid ground on the other side of the Nebel. Meanwhile Eugene had been actively engaged on the extreme right, where he too had crossed the Nebel . . . The admirable steadiness of the Prussians, who on this occasion gave tokens of what they were to become under the great Frederick, prevented a total defeat in that quarter. Immovable they stood their ground amidst the thundering charges of horse, the front rank kneeling, and the rear maintaining a ceaseless rolling fire, till at length the enemy, wearied with fruitless efforts, drew off, leaving the ground covered with their wounded and dying.”—Vol. i. pp. 171—174.

And now the decisive moment arrived when Marlborough, having gained a firm footing with both his cavalry and infantry beyond the Nebel, commenced a general attack between Blenheim and Oberglau.

“Indescribably grand was the spectacle which ensued. In compact order and the finest array the allied, mustering eight thousand sabres, moved up the gentle slope in two lines; at first slowly, as on a field-day, but gradually more quickly, as they drew nearer, and the fire of the artillery became more violent. The French horse, ten thousand strong, stood their ground at first firmly: the choicest and bravest of their chivalry was there: the banderoles of almost all the nobles of France floated over their squadrons. So hot was the fire of musquetry and cannon when the assailants drew near that their advance was checked: they retired sixty paces, and the battle was kept up for a few minutes only by a fire of artillery. Gradually, however, the fire of the enemy slackened; and Marlborough, taking advantage of the pause, led his cavalry again to the charge. With irresistible vehemence the line dashed forward at full speed, and soon the crest of the ridge was passed.

The French horsemen discharged their carbines at a considerable distance with little effect, and immediately wheeled about and fled. The battle was gained: the allied horse rapidly inundated the open space between the two villages; the nine battalions in the middle were surrounded, cut to pieces, or taken. They made a noble resistance, and the men were found lying on their backs in their ranks as they had stood in the field.

“The consequences of this great disaster on the right were speedily felt along the whole French line. Marsin's cavalry, now entirely uncovered on their flanks, rapidly fell back to avoid being turned, and rendered the position of the infantry in front of Eugene no longer tenable. That skilful general, perceiving the rout of the enemy on his left, and correctly judging that they could no longer maintain their ground, prepared his troops for a fourth charge, and soon issued forth at their head. The impulse of victory was now communicated to the whole line. After an arduous struggle in the plain, the enemy fell back at all points towards Oberglau and Lutzingen. Soon the flames, which burst forth from their buildings, announced that they were to be evacuated. At this sight, loud cheers arose from the whole right, and the Danes and Prussians rushed forward with irresistible vigour against the burning villages. After an obstinate conflict Lutzingen was carried, and the Bavarians were driven to a fresh position in rear, behind the streamlet of the same name. They still preserved their ranks, however, and faced about fiercely on their pursuers; but Marsin, having lost the pivot of his left, and seeing his flank entirely uncovered by Marlborough's advance, and the centre driven back in disorder, gave orders for the general retreat of his wing.

“Meanwhile Tallard, whose personal intrepidity was as conspicuous as his foresight was defective, was bravely exerting himself, but in vain, to arrest the disorder in the right and centre. He drew up the remains of his cavalry in battle array, behind the tents of his camp, in a single line stretching towards Blenheim, in order, if possible, to extricate the infantry posted in that village, which were now well nigh cut off. At the same time he sent pressing requests to Marsin for assistance. But ere succour could arrive, or time had even been gained for the delivery of his messages, the hand of fate was upon him. Marlborough, observing that the line was unsupported in rear, and uncovered on its right, gave orders for a general charge of all his cavalry. When the trumpet sounded, eight thousand horsemen, flushed with victory, bore down in *two lines*, with irresistible force, on the now dispirited and attenuated line of the enemy. The immense body of the French force, who were discouraged by having no support in rear, broke without awaiting the shock; and the allied cavalry rapidly piercing their centre, they were divided into two parts, one of which fled in wild disorder towards the Danube, and the other towards Hochstedt; Marlborough in person followed the first with fifty squadrons, while Hompesch with thirty pressed upon the second. Both pursuits proved entirely successful. Marlborough drove the broken mass before him headlong to the Danube,

where great numbers were drowned in attempting to cross, and the remainder were made prisoners on the brink. Marshal Tallard himself, with a small body of horse, which still kept their ranks, threw himself into the village of Sonderheim, on the margin of the river; but, being speedily surrounded by the victorious squadrons of the enemy, he was obliged to surrender, and delivered his sword to the Prince of Hesse. Hompesch, at the same time, vigorously pressed on the broken fugitives who had fled towards Hochstedt, and on the way surrounded three battalions of infantry, who were striving to escape, and made them prisoners. Upon seeing this, the cavalry entirely broke their ranks, and fled as fast as their horses could carry them towards Morselingen, without attempting any further resistance.

“When Tallard was taken, Marlborough immediately sent his own carriage to accommodate him, and dispatched a pencil note, written on the parapet of a bridge, to the Duchess, to say the battle was gained.”—Vol. i. pp. 174—178.

The battle was gained! But the conqueror did not relax in his endeavours to obtain the advantages and secure the fruits of victory. He first directed his attention to the left wing of the enemy, which was falling back, closely followed by Eugene's horse, in the direction of Morselingen. He was about to attack them in person, when the charge was countermanded, under a mistaken impression, arising from the smoke and darkness, that they were Eugene's men; and they thus escaped without serious loss. The fate of the troops, however, stationed in Blenheim was very different; surrounded and assailed on all sides, after a gallant resistance, having vainly endeavoured to obtain a capitulation, they were compelled to surrender at discretion.

“In this battle, Marlborough's wing lost 5000 men, and Eugene's 6000—in all 11,000. The French lost 13,000 private men made prisoners, and 1200 officers, almost all taken by Marlborough's wing, besides thirty-four pieces of cannon, twenty-five standards, and ninety colours: Eugene took thirty pieces more. The killed alone were no less than 12,000; and this is admitted by the French historians themselves. The total loss of the French and Bavarians, including those who deserted during their calamitous retreat through the Black Forest, was not less than 40,000 men—a number greater than any which France sustained till the still more disastrous day of Waterloo.”—Vol. i. pp. 180, 181.

The results of this brilliant victory were vast and momentous. Bavaria crushed, Austria saved, Germany delivered, bore ample witness to the victor's prowess. The dazzling and terrible *prestige* of the *Grand Monarque* was gone—destroyed for ever; his bravest generals, his finest troops, had been checked, routed, annihilated in the midst of their career of universal conquest;

and the remnants of the host which had threatened Vienna were driven in terror and confusion to take refuge beyond the Rhine.

“Honours and emoluments of every description were showered on the English hero for this glorious success. He was created a prince of the Holy Roman Empire, and a tract of land in Germany, at Mindelsheim, erected into a principality in his favour. . . . His reception at the courts of Berlin and Hanover resembled that of a sovereign prince; the acclamations of the people in all the towns through which he passed rent the air; at the Hague his influence was such, that he was regarded as the real Stadtholder. More substantial rewards awaited him in his own country. The munificence of the Queen and the gratitude of Parliament conferred upon him the extensive honour and manor of Woodstock, long a royal palace. . . . By order of the Queen not only was this noble estate settled on the duke and his heirs, but the royal comptroller commenced a magnificent palace for the duke on a scale worthy of his services and England's gratitude.”—Vol. i. pp. 187—189.

We ought not to omit, that Marlborough's humanity to the wounded, whether friends or foes, after the victory, equalled his skill and bravery during the action.

“Among the prisoners was a common soldier, whose gallantry during the action had particularly attracted the notice of the English general. ‘Your master,’ said he to him, ‘would be invincible if he had many soldiers such as you.’ ‘My king,’ answered the soldier, ‘does not want soldiers such as me, but a general such as you.’”—Vol. i. p. 188.

For the campaigns of 1705 and 1706, the battle of Ramillies, and the conquest of Flanders, we must refer our readers to Mr. Alison's pages, where every siege has its charm, every encounter its interest, every march and countermarch its attraction. This indeed is one of the marvellous excellencies of the book, that the most precise, accurate, and technical details are made both intelligible and delightful to the general reader. We cannot, however, avoid remarking on the tact and patience which Marlborough evinced at this period in stilling the jealousies, and arousing the energies of the various allied powers; on the repeated interference of the Dutch deputies to check him on the very eve of triumph; on the humanity and courtesy which he evinced after every conflict; and the wise and generous policy by which he conciliated and attached the Flemings.

We can do no more than allude to Eugene's brilliant campaign in Italy, and the changing fortunes of the war in Spain.

Far different was the progress of the allied cause in the year 1707 from what it had previously been. Great alarm was caused in its commencement by the appearance in Germany of Charles XII. of Sweden; and all Marlborough's skill was required to prevent

the most disastrous consequences. The portrait of the northern warrior is nobly drawn, and his interview with the English hero graphically described. After, however, the Duke had apparently mastered every difficulty, and was about to crush the French forces on their own frontier, the base and traitorous selfishness of the Dutch prevented his being able to accomplish any thing. In other quarters the Bourbon cause prospered more decidedly. The French were successful on the Rhine, Eugene failed in an attack upon Toulon, and the battle of Almanza decided the Spanish war in favour of Philip V.

More serious dangers however threatened the cause of European freedom from the decline of Marlborough in his sovereign's favour. And we must occupy a few lines with a brief résumé of the causes of this decline, which eventually led to his fall.

Devoted himself to his queen's interest, and his country's prosperity, Marlborough identified himself with none of the parties who were contending for place and power. It was his wish—a wish shared by his friend Godolphin—to govern the country for the country's good, without the trammels or the support of faction. Whig and Tory had brought about the Revolution, were interested in the maintenance of the constitution, in the independence, prosperity, and glory of their common country; and this great man therefore conceived that without any compromise of principle, they might combine both to rule and to serve the state. Marlborough was apparently ignorant of the very important truth, that though men denounce in theory a compromise of principle, what they recoil from in practice is a compromise of interest. It is possible indeed, that had Marlborough remained in England, he might, by his influence with the queen, his ability and vigour, his policy and address, have carried on the government in conjunction with his friend Godolphin during the whole of the queen's reign. His absence on the Continent however rendered the scheme impossible. Whilst the best and bravest of Britain's sons was spending his energies and risking his life in her service, his enemies had ample time to organize their forces, arrange their campaigns, and insure their final triumph—a victory as complete, though not quite as glorious, either to themselves or their country, as Blenheim, Ramillies, Oudenarde, or Malplaquet.

The conduct of Harley and St. John was mean, base, treacherous, and ungrateful in the extreme. They systematically employed every energy and every art to undermine the ministry with which they were acting, and to alienate the queen from her most faithful and zealous friends.

The conduct of the Whig party was characterized by selfishness, rapacity, and tyrannous insolence; they distrusted and

misused Marlborough, because he was unwilling to encourage their monopoly; they incensed the whole Tory party, and disgusted the nation, by their exclusive appropriation of place, and their ravenous appetite for pelf and power; and they at once outraged the queen's feelings, by forcing upon her ministers justly and personally obnoxious; whilst they arrayed her conscience against their cause, by presuming to interfere with her distribution of Church patronage.

The conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough was even more pernicious to her husband's interests, than that of his selfish friends or subtle foes. Besides personally affronting the queen by her violent and overbearing conduct, she identified herself with the most outrageous demands of the Whig ministry, and thus paved the way for the rise of her *protégée*—her rival, her supplanter, the celebrated Mrs. Masham.

Add to all this, that although, from the details and documents now before the public, we are enabled entirely to acquit the great commander of any desire to prolong the war, either for the sake of his own interest, or his own power, or his own renown, the British parliament and the British public were not in possession of those data; and to them, ignorant of the vacillation of the Germans and the baseness of the Dutch, it naturally appeared unaccountable, that victory after victory left the war still unfinished, the work undone; little dreaming, as how should they! that had Marlborough had his own way, he would, ere the conclusion of 1705, have dictated terms to Louis in the palace of Versailles.

We must remember, also, that there was more than one section of the politicians of that day who were inclined to favour, even if not determined to effect, the restoration of the exiled family, not merely the party called *Jacobites*, but others, who thought that justice and expediency were equally interested in the recall of the Chevalier, upon carefully guarded conditions. Such persons viewed with regret the humiliation of France, with distrust the alliance of Holland, and laboured according to their characters, by fair or by foul means, to overthrow him who was the living soul as well as the mighty warrior, the heart and head, as well as the right hand, of the Grand Alliance.

And the Queen of England herself was indignant as a sovereign, and rightly so, at the invasion of her prerogative; was incensed, as a private individual, at the personal insults heaped upon her; was aroused as a Churchwoman to a vivid, and not altogether groundless apprehension, that the Church was in danger!

Had she ascended the throne vacated by her father, merely to

sanction the reality of an oligarchical republic by the form of a limited monarchy? Had she shown favour, and generosity, and kindness, and confidence, to be subjected to insult, outrage, and rapacity? Had she sacrificed every tie, and every feeling of her heart and her conscience, for the sake of the Church, and was that Church now to be delivered, bound hand and foot, to the tender mercies of those greedy and arbitrary politicians who viewed her highest offices but as parts of a state machine, and grasped at her emoluments as they did at all other sources of wealth, like voracious sharks, or unclean vultures ravening for prey?

Truly Good Queen Anne had reason to look about her, to distrust her advisers, and dislike her position; nor must we judge too severely of her, if, in ridding herself of the very suspicious and decidedly unpleasant *ménage* which had grown up around her, she abandoned to his fate one whom the force of circumstances had identified with her persecutors.

We have thought it better to deal thus at some length with the causes of the decline and fall of Marlborough, and then to leave the matter, devoting our remaining space to brighter and gladder themes; for we would fain close our article in sunshine rather than in shadow, and conclude our notice of the victor's career with the shouts of victory, and the psalms of thanksgiving, undivided and undisturbed by the contests of faction or the clamours of envy.

Already had the campaign of 1708, which opened with the surprise of Ghent and Bruges by the French, witnessed their total defeat in another great pitched battle, that of Oudenarde, followed by the siege and capture of Lille, that masterpiece of French fortification, and the recovery of Ghent and Bruges. That battle is well worth studying; that siege is in every point of view one of the most wonderful achievements in the annals of war. But we may not pause, however loth to move on; for time, or rather space, presses. Proceed we then to the year 1709, when

“The pride of the French monarch was now so much reduced, that he sent the President Rouillé to Holland, with public instructions to offer terms to the allies, and with private directions to do every thing possible to sow dissension among them, and if possible to detach Holland from the alliance.”—Vol. ii. p. 11.

The conference, however, ended in nothing, neither party being disposed to accept the terms of the other.

“The rigorous terms demanded, however, by the allied cabinets, and the resolute conduct of the King of France in rejecting them, had an important effect upon the war, and called for more vigorous efforts

on the part of the confederates than they had yet put forth, or were even now disposed to make. Louis made a touching appeal to the patriotic spirit of his people, in an eloquent circular, which he addressed to the prelates and nobles of his realm. . . . The appeal was not made in vain to the spirit of a gallant nobility, and the patriotism of a brave people. It kindled a flame of general enthusiasm and loyalty. All ranks and parties vied with each other in contributing their property and personal service for the maintenance of the war. . . . The stoppage of commerce, and shock to credit, threw numbers out of employment; and starving multitudes crowded to the frontier, to find that subsistence amidst the dangers of war which they could no longer find in the occupations of peace. . . . They found the means . . . to pay the troops and retain them in the bonds of discipline. They regularly paid the soldier his dues—the officer alone was kept in arrear. It was presumed that he would act from a spirit of patriotism and honour, and the expectation was not disappointed. . . .

“Skilfully availing themselves of this burst of patriotic fervour, the ministers of Louis were enabled to open the campaign with greater forces than they had ever collected since the beginning of the war. The principal effort was made in Flanders, where the chief danger was to be apprehended, and the enemy's most powerful army and greatest general were to be faced. Fifty-one battalions and forty-nine squadrons were drawn from the Rhine to Flanders; and this large reinforcement, joined to the crowd of recruits which the public distress impelled to his standard, enabled the renowned Marshal Villars, who had received the command of the French, to take the field at the head of 112,000 men. With this imposing force he took a position, strong both by nature and art, extending from Douai to the Lys; the right resting on the canal of Douai, the centre covered by the village of La Bassée, the left supported by Bethune and its circumjacent marshes. The whole line was strengthened by redoubts and partial inundations, and traversed in front by a ditch fifteen feet wide, covered by exterior works. The banks of the canal, as far as Douai, were lined with troops. Never at any former period had France sent such an army into the field; never had she one animated with so enthusiastic and gallant a spirit. The soldiers equally with the nobles, were aware that this was the last effort for the independence of France. . . . The *ban* and *arrière ban* of France was in the field.”—Vol. ii. pp. 21—25.

The position of the French army was absolutely impregnable. Seeing such to be the case, Marlborough and Eugene determined on laying siege to Tournay; and having deceived Villars by a threatened attack, they succeeded in investing that important fortress on the morning of the 28th of June, whilst half of its garrison were still absent in the French lines. On the 29th of July the town surrendered, and the governor retired with the remains of the garrison, still 4000 strong, into the citadel.

“The garrison, though inadequate to the defence of Tournay, was quite adequate to that of the citadel; and the vast mines with which the whole outworks and glacis were perforated, rendered the approaches in the highest degree perilous and difficult. . . . The dangers of this species of service, at all times great, were here immensely aggravated by the extraordinary pains taken to make this subterranean warfare as formidable as possible. The miners frequently met, and fought with those of the enemy; and sometimes the troops, mistaking friend for foe, killed their fellow-soldiers: sometimes whole companies entered the mines at the very moment when they were ready primed for explosion. They were often inundated with water, suffocated with smoke, or buried alive in cavities, where they were left to perish. Sometimes numbers were blown into the air, and their limbs scattered to a distance, like burning stones from a volcano. . . . The first to mount a breach, to effect a lodgment in a hornwork, to penetrate into a mine, was sure to perish. First a hollow rumbling noise was heard, which froze the bravest hearts with horror; a violent rush, as of a subterraneous cataract, succeeded; and immediately the earth heaved, and whole companies, and even battalions, were scattered in a frightful explosion.”—Vol. ii. pp. 32—34.

At length on the 3rd of September the citadel surrendered, and its brave garrison were allowed to march out with all the honours of war, as a tribute to the gallantry which they had shown in its defence, with the sole condition of not serving again till they were exchanged.

No sooner was Tournay taken than the allied generals turned their eyes towards Mons, which, with the exception of Valenciennes, constituted the only remaining stronghold which lay between them and Paris. By the exercise of consummate skill, daring energy, and almost incredible rapidity, the formidable lines, thirty leagues in length, upon which Marshal Villars had been labouring with the greatest assiduity during the two last months, were turned, Mons was passed, and invested on the side of France.

“Every thing announced a more sanguinary and important conflict between the renowned commanders and gallant armies now arrayed on the opposite sides than had yet taken place since the commencement of the war. . . . The allied army consisted of 139 battalions and 252 squadrons, with 105 guns, mustering 93,000 combatants. It was divided into two corps: the one, under the immediate direction of Marlborough, consisting of 104 battalions and 163 squadrons; the other, under that of Eugene, mustered 66 battalions and 108 squadrons. The detachments at the siege of Mons and at Tournay reduced the force in the field to the amount above stated. Eugene had the post of honour on the right; Marlborough on the left. The two armies, therefore, were as nearly as possible equal in point of military strength,

—a slight numerical superiority on the part of the French being compensated by a superiority of twenty-five guns on that of the allies. Among the French nobles present at the battle were no less than twelve who were afterwards marshals of France. The son of James II., under the name of the Chevalier de St. George, who combined the graces of youth with the hereditary valour of his race, was there; St. Hilaire and Folard, whose works afterwards threw such light on military science, were to be found in its ranks. The Garde-du-Corps, Mousquetaires Grés, Grenadiers-à-Cheval, French, Swiss, and Bavarian Guards, as well as the Irish Brigade, stood among the combatants. The Montmorencies were there, and the De Guiches, the De Grammonts, and De Coignys. The reverses of Louis had called forth the flower of the nobility, as well as the last reserves of the monarchy."—Vol. ii. pp. 39—45.

Once more, however, the Dutch field deputies checked Marlborough's successful career; and the allied army, by delaying the attack until the arrival of reinforcements from Tournay, gave Villars time to entrench himself in what was considered an impregnable position. Whether it were so or no was to be decided by the result of the coming day.

"At three o'clock on the morning of the 11th, Divine Service was performed with the utmost decorum at the head of every regiment, and listened to by the soldiers, after the example of their chief, with the most devout attention. The utmost regularity pervaded their ranks as, with a slow but steady step, the troops marched from their bivouacs to the posts assigned them in the field. The awful nature of the occasion; the momentous interest at stake; the uncertainty who might survive to the close of the day; the protracted struggle soon to be brought to a decisive issue,—had banished all lighter feelings, and impressed a noble character on that impressive solemnity. A thick fog overspread the field, under cover of which the troops marched to their appointed stations; the guns were brought forward to the grand battery in the centre, which was protected on either side by an *épaulement*, to prevent an enfilade. No sooner did the French outposts give notice that the allies were preparing an attack, than the whole army stood to their arms, and all the working parties who were still toiling in the trenches laid aside their tools and joyfully resumed their places in the ranks. Never since the commencement of the war had the spirit of the French soldiers been so high, or had so enthusiastic a feeling been infused into every bosom. They looked forward with confidence to regaining, under their beloved Marshal Villars, the laurels which had been withered in eight successive campaigns, and arresting the flood of conquest which threatened to overwhelm their country. . . . On the allied side, enthusiasm was not so loudly expressed, but confidence was not less strongly felt. It was the anniversary of the glorious victory of the Zenta, gained on September 11, 1697, by Prince Eugene

over 150,000 Turks. The soldiers all knew this, and relied with reason on the tried and splendid abilities of their chiefs, on their own experienced constancy and success in the field. They had the confidence of veteran soldiers who had long fought and conquered together."—Vol. ii. pp. 49, 50.

We cannot, however, follow the combatants into the desperate battle of MALPLAQUET, the most bloody and obstinately contested which had yet occurred in the war, and in which the antagonists on both sides displayed equal valour and heroism. Suffice it to say that the allies in the end proved victorious, forced the enemy's position, drove them to a considerable distance from the field, and prevented them from raising the siege of Mons, which surrendered before the close of the campaign.

And now we must conclude with one short extract more, illustrating the piety and humanity of the great Duke of Marlborough:—

"The woods and intrenchments were filled with wounded French, above three thousand in number, the whole of whom fell into the hands of the allies; and those who survived, about fifteen hundred, augmented the number of the prisoners. These Marlborough, with characteristic humanity, proposed to Villars to remove to the French quarters, on condition of their being considered prisoners of war,—an offer which that general thankfully accepted. A solemn thanksgiving was read in all the regiments of the army two days after the battle; after which the soldiers of both armies joined in removing the wounded French, on two hundred waggons, to the French camp. Thus, after the conclusion of one of the bloodiest fights recorded in modern history, the first acts of the victors were in raising the voice of thanksgiving and doing deeds of mercy."

- ART. II.—1. *Arundines Cami, sive Musarum Cantabrigiensium Lusus Canori. Collegit atque Edidit HENRICUS DRURY, A.M. Fourth Edition.* 1851.
2. *Anthologia Oxoniensis. Decerpit GUL. LINWOOD.* Longman. 1846.
3. *Sabrinæ Corolla. In hortulis Regiæ Scholæ Salopiensis contextuerunt tres viri floribus legendis.* G. Bell. 1850.
4. *Sacred History, in sense for Latin Verses. By the Rev. F. HODGSON, Archdeacon of Derby, &c. Third Edition.* Taylor and Walton. 1839.
5. *Excerpta à Testamento Veteri, &c. Key to the above.* J. Taylor. 1828.
6. *Mythology for Versification. By the Rev. F. HODGSON, Provost of Eton College. Fifth Edition.* Taylor, Walton, and Maberly. 1851.
7. *Mythologia Versibus Latinis Accommodata. Key to the above.* Taylor, Walton, and Maberly. 1850.
8. *Sacred Lyrics for Versification. By the Rev. F. HODGSON, Provost of Eton College.* Taylor and Walton. 1842.
9. *Lyricorum Sacrorum Clavis Metrica. Scriptore F. HODGSON, Coll. Regal., Eton. Præposito.* Taylor, Walton, and Maberly. 1850.

SOME forty years ago, the determined and brilliant onslaughts of our great Northern contemporary produced a very general misgiving throughout the educated and educating portion of mankind in this country, that they had been proceeding upon erroneous principles in the important work of training the young for the coming battle of life. The system of education pursued in our public schools and universities was unsparingly attacked; it was urged that much was taught which it was useless to know, and much unknown which ought to be taught; that the amount of Latin and Greek there learnt was out of all proportion to the advantage to be derived by such learning; and that much time which might have been expended in acquiring a considerable knowledge of history, sciences, and the affairs of serious life, was wasted in obtaining a comparatively fruitless triumph in the arena

of what were termed frivolous and fanciful accomplishments. Upon no part of the despised "curriculum" of our youth were the inkhorns of the ridicule of the immortal Sidney Smith¹ more lavishly poured forth than upon the time-honoured discipline of "longs and shorts." The practice of them was trifling; perfection in them was imbecility; and the folly of training up youth to the attainment of such perfection, was the most glaring evil of our school and college education.

Now we are not about to deny that at the time of these denunciations great and manifest abuses existed; we are not so ungrateful for the vast improvements since introduced as to shut our eyes to the imperfections which they have displaced. On the contrary, we are convinced that our schools and colleges have since made, and are daily making, gigantic but steady strides in advance, and are daily approaching nearer and nearer towards the accomplishment of real *education* in the highest sense of that word. We moreover believe that these improvements are in a great measure owing to the very attacks to which we have alluded, and to the public attention thereby drawn to the subject; for we cannot deny that a spirit of antiquity haunts the chosen abodes of learning, somewhat too jealous of novelty and change to conform itself readily to the expansion of knowledge in the world without. Those therefore who on due occasion point out existing errors, and suggest timely alterations to meet the advanced requirements of society, do good service, and command our thanks. So also do those who, shaking off the predilections and prejudices of former times, and the partiality we are too apt to feel for those pursuits wherein we have ourselves excelled "when George the Third was King," have not scrupled to open wider the gates of knowledge, and, like the members of Eton College and King's College, Cambridge, have resolved to give to their successors opportunities of distinction in branches of knowledge in which they were never called upon or allowed to excel. More than all are we grateful to those who by their private munificence and public spirit have been led to throw down for competition at our *universities* and *schools* those prizes which are to lead our young men to bestow on other equally useful and perhaps more congenial studies those talents which have hitherto been spent upon classical and mathematical learning alone, and which are to induce our boys to construe their Dante and Sismondi as fluently as they now translate Thucydides and Virgil. All these things we accept with gladness; we fully believe them to be very good; and as the world increases in knowledge and

¹ Works, vol. i.

wisdom, more good things of a like kind will be required, and done.

But while these salutary changes have been in progress, it does undoubtedly happen that some parts of the old system, in spite of all attacks, remain but little altered, and, having borne the brunt of ridicule and grave hostility, still flourish in our colleges and schools. One of these standing features of English education is the practice which still prevails of teaching the art of writing Latin verses. We shall not discuss at length the arguments on both sides of the once much-vexed question, whether this be a custom "more honoured in the breach than the observance;" but shall assume for the present that a practice which has been so vigorously assailed, and so fully and ably discussed, and to excel in which is at least not inconsistent with excellence in all the most exalted qualities that can belong to man, still continues to exist, not owing to mere reverence for antiquity, but because it has been well tested, and found to be an useful process in the business of producing men for the highest purposes of life.

If we are right in making this assumption, it may be a not unprofitable task to call attention to the present condition of the science of Latin versification; to point out the changes for better or worse which have been introduced in the methods of acquiring and employing this kind of accomplishment; and to recommend that which seems the best mode of smoothing the access to a really sound and useful prosecution of this species of learning during the few years which, we venture to think, are not *now* too largely devoted to it.

The manifest tendency of modern methods of instruction lies in the direction of accuracy and precision. The influence of abstract science upon the less exact branches of education has been sensible, gradual, and steady. A few books of Euclid have entered into the course of instruction at almost all our larger schools; and even that little leaven has leavened the whole lump. The mathematics have, lately, been introduced at Eton, as a compulsory part of education. The same has been the case at Harrow, for a longer period. The ruthless edict said to have been issued at the commencement of his career of office by the excellent and amiable master of Eton against that convenient combination "*amplius haud*," is a type of the war which modern accuracy is waging against the unmeaning, the common-place, and the slipshod in education. In the practice of original composition in the dead languages which at one time prevailed, one evil undoubtedly existed in the diffuse and desultory style of writing and thinking which it encouraged. Extreme vigilance on the part of the teacher might

check this tendency to some extent, but this was more than could always be looked for ; while the student himself was almost sure to mistake facility for merit and quantity for quality. This evil required to be checked and controlled, not by the rude method occasionally adopted of passing the pen abruptly through the superfluous half of the cherished composition, but by the constant presence of a model to which he was constrained to conform himself by an invisible pressure.

The substitution of translation to a great extent for original composition, has had, we believe, a most salutary effect in this respect. The very aptness for imitation natural to the boy tends, in the first instance, to confine him with the utmost closeness to the very words and measure that are placed before him. His first impulse in translation is to render line for line, if not word for word ; and he feels from the first the pleasure " which poets only know " of overcoming difficulties ; he lends himself unconsciously to the mysterious fascination which submission to rule exercises over the human mind, the same which gives a zest to the games of the school field and the discipline of the camp. While the power of imitation is all but universal in the young, that of invention is extremely rare ; and nearly in the same proportion is the faculty of translation within the scope of the abilities of more, than that of original composition ; and we conceive that it is much more agreeable to almost all. If the principal object of enforcing composition, whether in verse or prose, is to ensure close attention to the words and style of the authors studied for that collateral purpose, and to exercise tact in seizing the analogies of language, it is obvious that more students will secure this advantage by the practice of translation than by that of original composition. There is also much greater variety in the necessary requirements of the one than of the other ; the ear will not be allowed to acquiesce in the recurrence of an uniform system of cadences, or the critical acumen be blunted by resort to conventional and trivial expedients. The matter and the form of a well-chosen passage from an English poet will demand, and at the same time suggest manifold experiments in language, in rhythm, and in thought ; every fresh perusal of the model will bring out the perception of fresh beauties to be hit off, and of fresh difficulties to be overcome ; the writer will not be allowed to rest satisfied with the perfection of his own performance, but will be constantly endeavouring to attain the unattainable in fidelity and elegance. Thus he will be trained to precision both of thought and language ; he will be subjected to the discipline, most severe to the youthful poetaster, of setting clearly before himself the idea to be expressed, and the means by which his end is to be accom-

plished'. The old comparison of rhetoric and logic to the extended palm and the closed fist, is at least equally applicable to the different characters of original composition and translation.

Such being our deliberate opinion, it will be an agreeable task to point, as we may with triumph, to some convincing proofs of the great excellence to which our young scholars attain in what we have ventured to consider not only as an elegant accomplishment, but as a sterling part of the education of men for the higher walks of useful life.

In the three works which we have placed first at the head of this article, Mr. Drury, Mr. Linwood, and Dr. Kennedy have collected, partly from the leaves of their own portfolios, partly from the contributions of their friends, a varied assortment of translations into Greek and Latin verse from some of the most elegant passages of English poetry. These compositions have, in many instances, been school and college exercises, often executed under stress of examination and the excitement of competition, and sometimes no doubt subsequently re-touched and revised at leisure. Some are the deliberate exertions of maturer scholars thrown off for their amusement, or as a trial of their powers, to balance the loss and the gain of advancing years. Mr. Drury's volume, the "*Arundines Cami*," has reached a fourth edition, and it would be beside our purpose to enter into any minute criticism of a work which has already had its thousands of readers, and which has evidently become a favourite with the cultivated public. The merits of the work and of its compiler, himself its principal and perhaps its most felicitous contributor, are proved not only by the admiration, but by the emulation which they have excited in other classical scholars, from whom, in this respect, at all events, Mr. Drury deserves to bear away the palm; that his is the original conception, that he has the credit (in these days a rare one) of having carved out what may be called a little *arrondissement* of his own in the department of classical literature. Mr. Linwood and Dr. Kennedy, who have given us similar volumes, have closely followed the original model, even in size, and shape, and type, and decoration; as far as they have deviated from it, in mixing original compositions with the translations, they have but

* It is difficult to say in *how* great a degree the mind of the boy must have been *educated* by the practice of Latin versification who, in the sixth form at Rugby produced the following exquisite version from Cibber's "*Blind Boy*,"—

"My day or night myself I make
Whene'er I sleep or play,
And, could I ever keep awake,
With me 't were always day :"

"Namque diem ludi faciunt mihi, somnia noctem,
Et, nisi dormirem, nox mihi nulla foret."

marred, as it seems to us, the simplicity of the design; though they have given us some conclusive evidence that the system which we recommend by no means interferes with the attainment, by those who seek it, of at least the pristine perfection of our scholars in spirited original composition.

Among the most beautiful of the translations to be found in these works, none appears to us more truly classical than that from Tennyson's *Ænëid* by Lord Lyttleton, with its exquisite idyllic "refrain," "*Ida meam genetrix, mors advenit, accipe vocem,*" "*O mother Ida, hearken ere I die.*" But it would be almost invidious to select where so much variety of excellence exists. One word of censure we think Mr. Drury deserves. We own and reverence the maxim, "*Ridentem dicere verum Quid vetat?*" We even recognize the force of the observation, "*Good nonsense is an exquisite thing;*" but jests may be carried too far, and we must confess to our disapprobation of employing the grave and serious occupations, of composing the types and correcting the press upon the reproduction of our old friends "*Humpty Dumpty*" and "*Little Boy Blue*" in the grotesque costumes of "*Humptius Dumptius*" and "*Cærule parve puer.*"

But it is now time to turn to another branch of our subject. Antecedent, and perhaps contributory, to the universal introduction of the system for which we have intimated our preference, have, as might have been anticipated, appeared from time to time works of a humble character in the commonwealth of letters, yet undoubtedly of higher practical utility than those we have been alluding to, works the aim of which has been to facilitate, and at the same time to place on a good foundation, the acquisition of that kind of scholarship which was gradually prevailing. A few of these we have selected for notice, as good specimens of their class. That it is desirable for youth to commence the study of any branch of learning with some assistance of helps and leading-strings prepared by those already eminent for the possession of the knowledge which is sought, few we conceive will be disposed to deny. Much time is thus saved, bad habits of composition are warded off, good taste and a high standard are more likely to have their due influence upon the scholar's mind. It is therefore of great importance that judicious and able assistance should be at hand, and we are fortunately well supplied in this respect.

The method adopted by the Provost of Eton in the three school-books whose titles we have extracted is well known and appreciated by our best instructors. Mr. Hodgson has the advantage of combining with considerable personal experience in tuition an extensive acquaintance with the best models of ancient poetry, and is himself a poet, both in Latin and English, elegant

in taste and graceful in execution. We believe that the idea of publishing "sense" for Latin verses, in which the pupil is led on gradually from imitating the easiest and fullest models to the use of mere skeletons of lines and hints for composition, was first executed by the late Mr. Bland, the proprietor of the translation from the Greek Anthology known by his name. Mr. Hodgson has expanded and improved upon the original suggestion, and by giving to his collections of models uniformity and connexion of subject, has produced the means of combining with the object of instruction in versification, that of imparting a knowledge of the particular subjects from which his "stories" for translation are selected. The "Mythology for Versification, or a Brief Sketch of the Fables of the Ancients prepared to be rendered into Latin Verse," has lately reached its fifth edition, and has been extensively used among the younger boys in many of our best schools. The title explains the design, and the execution justifies the title. The Latin verses into which the Fables are to be rendered, are remarkable for their elegance and correctness; they are judiciously suggested by the English version, and we venture to assert that a boy of average abilities would gain a much more satisfactory insight into the popular parts of the Heathen Mythology by going through this book with his tutor than by resorting to his *Lempriere* from time to time, as a hero or demigod comes across his path in reading his *Ovid* or his *Virgil*.

But among the objections made to the study of Latin versification, one of the most common had been that founded on what was called the useless or even the mischievous familiarity with the Heathen Mythology required from its proficient. Mr. Hodgson accordingly, in order to obviate scruples in which he candidly confesses that he does not share, conceived the design of versifying such part of the Bible history as seemed adapted for the purpose, and publishing it, so to speak, for re-versification into Latin. In this very difficult task he has also succeeded, and has fully justified the assertion in his preface, "The Bible confessedly abounds in subjects well adapted to poetry; and perhaps affords examples of such phraseology as may sometimes less unsuitably be imitated in Latin than in English versification."

The third of Mr. Hodgson's contributions to our educational literature is of later and far more difficult execution, and deserves, as we trust it will enjoy, similar popularity with its predecessors. It is the first attempt that has been made to smooth the path to the successful use of the lyric and iambic metres in Latin composition. A boy who is sufficiently advanced in his knowledge of the Latin language, and in the cultivation of his ear and taste, to be ready for introduction to the imitation of the beauties of *Horace*

or Catullus, will still require delicate and skilful guidance; and before he is allowed to luxuriate unrestrained in original odes, or versions of Gray or Collins, it will be wise, in a great majority of instances, to lead him gently through a similar process to that we have described in the case of elegiacs and hexameters. The models set before him must not be devoid of poetical merit; and to make these at the same time simple and plain both in diction and imagery, requires consummate tact, and an exquisite sense of the spirit of ancient poetry on the part of the instructor. Difficult as is the task of providing such models, Mr. Hodgson in the "Sacred Lyrics" has we think eminently succeeded in supplying every requisite. There is much real poetical excellence in most of the compositions, and they breathe throughout a classical and Horatian air which cannot fail to influence the mental texture of an intelligent and sensitive pupil, and mould him to the appreciation of the most exquisite of ancient models.

As it is possible that some of our readers may not be distinctly acquainted with the precise scheme upon which this description of exercise is constructed, a brief explanation of it may, perhaps, be desirable.

In the first place, then, it must be understood, that for some considerable time previously to the publication of the earliest of these little works, Mr. Hodgson had been in the habit of poetical composition in Latin verse, and in various metres, upon Mythological and upon Sacred subjects. These compositions he subsequently adapted to the purposes of school exercises in Latin verse, in the following manner, viz. his own composition was literally translated by himself from the Latin into English. This translation, together with certain interlineal suggestions, is, in each instance, laid before the young practitioner; whose business it is, with the help of those interlineal suggestions, to produce, from the translation, a Latin version of his own. This version is, lastly, to be compared with Mr. Hodgson's own composition, as the model; the models being published each in a separate volume, as the "Clavis Metrica." To this "Clavis" the student is to have no access, until his own *tentamen* is completed; and the comparison of this *tentamen* with the model furnishes the criterion of his success. A brief example from the "Sacred Lyrics," it is hoped, will render this explanation quite intelligible:—

From Isaiah liii. 1, &c.

The following is the "Exercise," viz. the literal translation into English, with suggestions interlined:—

For, "As the tender grass in the sight of Heaven,
As a small root growing (from) a dry soil,

He shall be born : to whom neither beauty of aspect,
expelo
 Nor comeliness of person, *to be desired*, shineth ;
 Who, when (he) is seen, rejected (by) the countenance of men,
sordeo
 And despised, *is thought vile* ; the offspring of affliction,
 Patient of sorrows ; whom the haughty eyes
genitive
 Refuse to behold, esteeming (him at) a *low* (price)."

The version of the learner, executed with the above assistance, is to be compared with the following verses from the "Clavis :"—

" Nam, ceu tenellum gramen in visu poli,
 Ceu parva radix arido crescens solo,
 Nascetur ille, cui nec aspectûs decor,
 Nec forma lucet expetenda corporis—
 Qui, cum videtur, ore rejectus virûm,
 Spretusque sordet ; ægrimonix genus,
 Patiens dolorum ; quem superba lumina
 Negant tueri, vilis æstimantia."

The above will show that the Sacred Scriptures, also, have supplied the subject matter of the poet's work ; and we think that the Provost of Eton deserves much commendation for the proof he has here given, that in spite of all that had been done, another mode still remained of doing yet more towards the great work of endearing the Bible to the young, by introducing school-boys (to use his own words) " to an early acquaintance with the beauties of the prophetic Scriptures." In this respect the work is likely to prove most valuable, especially as the extracts from the sacred writers are given in chronological order, and a short but satisfactory account of each, and of the leading points of his history and character is prefixed.

We are tempted to add an extract or two more from the Latin models, into which the scholar, if he selects his Latin words successfully, will translate, with a few minutes' thought, some parts of these exercises—and we are mistaken if they have not, while they show a mind imbued with classical culture, preserved the spirit and poetry of the original so as almost to ensure their perception by the scholar who has once accomplished the version ; and this, however often he might before have heard the passage from which it is taken, read, without attaching to it one half its meaning, or feeling a tithe of its beauty. Take the following passage from the 19th chapter of Job :—

" Quamdiu verbis miserum malignis
 Vultis injusti premere, o Sodales

Cogniti frustrà, quid amara mecum
Jurgia tantâ

“ Mole miscetis ? Mihi siquid olim
Perperam factum fuit, anne vestrum
Agmen irasci decet ? ” &c.

How admirably do these lines express the heart-broken and impatient remonstrances of the stricken prophet ! How faithfully and yet not servilely do they follow the magnificent language of our English version !

We cannot resist the pleasure of transcribing one more specimen in another metre. It is a translation of the sublime 64th chapter of Isaiah, and is in parts wonderfully close to the original :—

“ O rupta cœli nubila dividas,
Jehova vindex ! O juga montium
Depressa descendant, ab omni
Parte, tuo liquefacta vultu.
“ Ut, cùm ferorum spiritus ignium
Increvit, undis fervor æstuat ;
Divina sic, grassans per orbem,
Vis agitet metuenda gentes.
“ Immo hâc nitescens, Summe, potentiâ
Olim intonabas terribili modo,
Sinæ in cacumen, cùm subacti
Voce Dei tremuere montes.
“ At, de vetusto limite temporum
Non aure quisquam non oculo decus
Accepit illud, quod paravit
Grande suis Pater Ipse natis.
“ Tu gestienti legibus in Tuis
Servare rectam Justitiæ viam
Tu, Numen, occurris ; piumque
Cingis iter clypeo salutis.
“ Sed nos probrosæ nequitiae genus,
Pannis tegentes pectora sordidis
Virtutis externæ, perimus,
Ceu fragiles rapit aura frondes,” &c.

It has been too much the fashion to depreciate all attempts to render into rhyme or metre the sacred poetry ; which can never be more poetically or beautifully expressed than in the transcendent prose of our English version of the Bible. Granted, that it is all but impossible to improve a single line of that magnificent model of language, we cannot therefore allow that other versions, prose and verse, are to be discouraged. In the study of languages and the cultivation of the taste, models must be studied

and revered; but the best mode of securing due reverence is by promoting attempts at imitation, and no attempts at imitation are so efficacious as those which are based upon the endeavour to express equally well in other languages that which is most near to perfection in our own. We think that Mr. Hodgson has often contrived so aptly to render some of the most beautiful passages in Scripture, that a school-boy following in his path, would feel that a new light had flashed across him, and be tempted to seek for further and deeper meaning in other passages hitherto but carelessly observed. This is surely a result the importance of which cannot be over-estimated, and it is one which, we rejoice to know, entered into the hopes of the amiable and accomplished scholar, when he undertook this arduous and enterprising task. In the preface to the "Select Portions of Sacred History," in which the "Sacred Lyrics" are announced as intended to follow, he says—

"If by these means any portion of additional knowledge of the Scriptures shall be conveyed to those of our youth who are engaged in the study of the Classics, the author will indeed have reason to rejoice in the time and attention that he has bestowed on such an undertaking."

We, too, heartily rejoice in this further proof, that those to whom education in these our days is intrusted, are alive to the vast importance of losing no opportunity of doing all to the glory of Him "who touched Isaiah's holy lips with fire," and whose word cannot be seriously pondered, without rendering the eloquent more eloquent, and yet more humble; the learned more learned, and yet more anxious to be taught.

We trust that works such as those we have referred to, and studies such as those we have recommended, may long continue to form a part of the education of our boys and young men. We believe the cultivation of a pure taste and classical style is most easily to be pursued by such means, and that the acquisition of a pure taste and classical style cannot be made without the acquisition of other advantages of the utmost value and importance, which it is our duty strenuously to attempt to ensure. We are, therefore, most grateful to those who pave the way for our youth first to imitate, and then to admire—as those alone *can* admire, who have *tried* to imitate—the beauties of thought, and language (models for all time to come), which teem in the pages of Lucretius and Virgil, of Ovid, of Horace, and of Catullus. Once impregnated with the choicest of those thoughts and masters of the flowers of that language, they will, in our opinion, infallibly become abler, wiser, and nobler men.

ART. III.—1. *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England.* By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., Priest of the Congregation of St. Philip Neri. London: Burns and Lambert. 8vo. pp. 388.

2. *Newman and the Protestant Logic.* From the "Weekly Dispatch," September 28, 1851.

3. *Discourses to Mixed Congregations.* By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. Second Edition. London: Longmans. 8vo. pp. 402.

4. *Letters to a Seceder from the Church of England to the Communion of Rome.* By W. E. SCUDAMORE, M.A., Rector of Ditchingham. London: Rivingtons. 8vo. pp. 326.

5. *A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Marshall, late a Clergyman of the Church of England, now a Roman Priest.* By the Rev. E. A. STOPFORD, Archdeacon of Meath, and Rector of Kells. Second Edition. London: Rivingtons. pp. 60.

6. *Report on the Law of Mortmain.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, July 17, 1851. pp. 690.

7. *A Continuous Confutation of the Birmingham Lectures.* By PRESBYTER. London: Masters. pp. 63.

BEFORE entering upon the subject of this paper, we must apologize to our readers for placing at the head of it any extract from the columns of so disreputable a journal as the "Weekly Dispatch." Before it is finished, we trust to be able to show that we have good and sufficient reasons for so doing.

Our object in writing this paper is twofold. The main idea which pervades Dr. Newman's Birmingham Lectures, the work which has gained for its author, of all his productions, the largest share of notoriety, is this—that "Protestants" have such a very indistinct notion of the real merits or demerits of Romanism—their prejudices are so inveterate—their passions so strong—their "evidence" so entirely based on fraudulent misrepresentation, and cool deliberate "lying"—that they are utterly unqualified for coming to any thing like a correct judgment respecting it. We purpose then, first, to examine, somewhat in detail, the Lectures themselves, correcting as we go on, a few of the "errors" into

which Dr. Newman has fallen. We purpose, afterwards, to inquire whether, independently of historical testimony, irrespective of its own internal organization, there have not occurred a number of *facts*, within the last few years, which do altogether of themselves, justify "Protestants" in entertaining that deep-seated suspicion and mistrust of Romanism which, most undoubtedly, does exist among us—

"If," says Dr. Newman in his fourth lecture, "you would have some direct downright proof that Catholicism is what Protestants make it to be, something which will come up to the mark, you must lie; else you will not get beyond feeble suspicions, which may be right, but may be wrong. Hence Protestants are obliged to cut their ninth commandment out of their Decalogue. 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour' must go, must disappear; their position requires the sacrifice. The substance, the force, the edge of their Tradition is slander¹."

We say nothing of the elegance of the phraseology employed in this passage, nor of the rashness of the allusion to a mutilation of the Decalogue; we quote it as containing the real germ of the whole series of Lectures. We purpose then, to combat Dr. Newman's assertion; to show, if there be any "lying" in the matter, to which side of the question it may most properly be ascribed.

Before, however, we proceed to the main business of this paper, we purpose to take a cursory glance at the volume of "*Sermons to mixed Congregations*," of which the second edition, published in the last year, is now lying before us; prefacing that glance by a few brief remarks of a personal nature, as to the estimate we have been compelled to form, from his writings, and from them only, of the character of the author. We deeply regret to say that that estimate is most unfavourable to Dr. Newman. And, in stating this, we claim the right of being believed, when we declare that this opinion is not one of our own seeking, is not the result of prejudice, but is forced upon us by circumstances. We should be ashamed of ourselves if the mere fact of Dr. Newman's position should, in the smallest degree, cause us to judge him harshly or unfairly. We can respect an opponent while compelled to differ from him. We would most gladly, if we dared, join with the able writer of the "*Continuous Confutation*" in expressing "our sincere admiration for Dr. Newman personally, and our full persuasion of his conscious sincerity." But we dare not do so. We *cannot* entertain a "sincere admiration" of one who, as in his Birmingham Lectures, has descended from the high position he once held, to a level with the mountebank and the buffoon.

Our notice of the "Sermons" must be very brief. Eloquent they undoubtedly are, and earnest, but they afford very sad evidence of the transformation which the grave, thoughtful, unimpassioned vicar of St. Mary's has undergone since his perversion. Wonderful it is even to imagine that many passages of the volume before us could possibly have been delivered by him from the pulpit. We are not now speaking of doctrine, but simply of the difference of style. Let any of our readers take up a volume of the sermons preached at St. Mary's, and then read the following extract; and let him say whether it is not very difficult to believe in the personal identity of the writer.

"O what a moment for the poor soul, when it comes to itself, and finds itself suddenly before the judgment-seat of Christ. . . . And, oh! still more terrible, still more distracting, when the Judge speaks, and consigns it to the jailors, till it shall pay the endless debt which lies against it! 'Impossible, I a lost soul! I separated from hope and from peace for ever! It is not I of whom the Judge so spake! There is a mistake somewhere; Christ, Saviour, hold Thy hand,—one minute to explain it! My name is Demas: I am but Demas, not Judas, or Nicolas, or Alexander, or Philetus, or Diotrephes. What? eternal pain! for me! impossible, it shall not be.' And the poor soul struggles and wrestles in the grasp of the mighty demon which has hold of it, and whose every touch is torment. 'O, atrocious!' it shrieks in agony, and in anger too, as if the very keenness of the infliction were a proof of its injustice. 'A second! and a third! I can bear no more! stop, horrible fiend, give over; I am a man, and not such as thou! I am not food for thee, or sport for thee! I never was in hell as thou, I have not on me the smell of fire, nor the taint of the charnel-house!'"

And again—

"You think it the sign of a gentleman to set yourselves above religion, to criticise the religious and professors of religion, to look at Catholic and Methodist with impartial contempt, to gain a smattering of knowledge on a number of subjects, to dip into a number of frivolous publications, if they are popular, to have read the latest novel, to have heard the singer and seen the actor of the day, *to be up to the news*, to know the names, and, if so be, the persons of public men, to be able to bow to them, to walk up and down the street with your heads on high, and to stare at whatever meets you;—and to say and do worse things, of which these outward extravagances are but the symbol²."

Side by side with this we would place the following passage from the Birmingham Lectures:—

² Pp. 40, 41.

³ Pp. 122, 123.

"The living Church is the test and the confutation of all false Churches; therefore get rid of her at all hazards; tread her down, gag her, dress her like a felon, starve her, bruise her features, if you would keep up your mumbo-jumbo in its place of pride⁴."

Let our readers say, after this, whether one portion, at least, of our estimate of Dr. Newman be true or false.

But we must treat rather more at length of a passage respecting the Blessed Virgin, which occurs in the sermon entitled the "Glories of Mary." Our readers have not, we trust, forgotten Mr. Dodsworth's very ingenious attempt to silence the scruples of "Anglicans" respecting the "Immaculate Conception," by the assertion that that question was left completely "open" in the Church of Rome. If they wish to see how far Dr. Newman considers the question one of "opinion" only, they may do so by a perusal of this sermon, which it is difficult to suppose Mr. Dodsworth had not seen when his pamphlet was written.

"Mary," says Dr. Newman, "is a specimen, and more than a specimen, in the purity of her soul and body, of what man was before his fall, and would have been, had he risen to his perfection. It had been hard, it had been a victory for the evil one, had the whole race passed away, nor an instance occurred to show what the Creator had intended it in its original state⁵."

And again—

"It was fitting, for His honour and glory, that she, who was the instrument of His bodily presence, should first be a miracle of His grace; it was fitting that she should triumph, where Eve had failed, and should 'bruise the serpent's head' by the spotlessness of her sanctity. In some respects, indeed, the curse was not reversed; Mary came into a fallen world, and resigned herself to its laws; she, as the Son she bore, was exposed to pain of soul and body, she was subjected to death, but she was not put under the power of sin. As grace was infused into Adam from the first moment of his creation, so that he never had experience of his natural poverty, till sin reduced him to it; so was grace given in still ampler measure to Mary, and she was a stranger to Adam's deprivation. She began where others end, whether in knowledge or in love. She was from the first clothed in sanctity, sealed for perseverance, luminous and glorious in God's sight, and incessantly employed in meritorious acts, which continued till her last breath⁶."

But it is not to the question of the "Immaculate Conception," that we wish now to direct our readers' particular attention.

⁴ P. 9.

⁵ P. 373.

⁶ Pp. 373—375.

We leave Dr. Newman and Mr. Dodsworth to settle that point between them as they may. We wish simply to quote the following passage:—

“She who was chosen to supply flesh and blood to the Eternal Word, was first filled with grace in soul and body; still, she had a double blessedness, of office, and of qualification for it, and the latter was the greater. And it is on this account that the Angel calls her blessed: ‘*Full of grace,*’ he says, ‘blessed among women;’ and St. Elisabeth also, when she cries out, ‘Blessed thou that hast *believed.*’ Nay, she herself bears a like testimony, when the Angel announced to her the favour which was coming on her. Though all Jewish women in each successive age had been hoping to be Mother of the Christ, so that marriage was honourable among them, celibacy a reproach, *she alone had put aside the desire and the thought of so great a dignity. She alone, who was to bear the Christ, refused to bear Him; He stooped to her, she turned from Him; and why? because she had been inspired, the first of womankind, to dedicate her virginity to God, and she did not welcome a privilege which seemed to involve a forfeiture of her vow.* How shall this be, she asked, seeing I am separate from man? Nor, till the Angel told her that the conception would be miraculous and from the Holy Ghost, did she put aside her ‘trouble’ of mind, recognize him securely as God’s messenger, and bow her head in awe and thankfulness to God’s condescension’.”

Now just consider well the language of the sacred text on this subject. St. Matthew tells us, “*When as his mother Mary WAS ESPOUSED to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.*” And St. Luke, speaking of the Annunciation, is equally plain. The angel Gabriel was sent “*to a virgin ESPOUSED to a man, whose name was Joseph.*” So that the Blessed Virgin, who, according to the written word of God, was actually “espoused” to her future husband, according to Dr. Newman, had, *at that very time*, “been inspired, the first of womankind, to dedicate her virginity to God!” We say nothing on Dr. Newman’s gloss about Mary’s “trouble” of mind. We simply ask, is it possible to *reconcile* these two statements? If the Scriptural account be true, what, on Dr. Newman’s hypothesis, *must* be the inference with respect to the Virgin? an inference far too blasphemous for us to draw. We submit, confidently, that, if Dr. Newman believed in the truth of his own words, “strong” indeed must have been the “delusion” to which he was “given over.” If he did not believe in them, then he

⁷ Pp. 372, 373.

⁸ μνηστευθείσης γὰρ τῆς μητρὸς—πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς.

⁹ I. 27. πρὸς παρθένον μεμνηστευμένην.

has deliberately falsified Holy Scripture for the sake of his own hypothesis.

But let us turn our attention from the Sermons to that production of Dr. Newman's, which it is the more especial object of this paper to discuss, we mean his "Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England,"—a production of which the whole "Catholic" world has sounded the praise; which is looked upon as a death-blow to "Protestantism," from which it is a moral impossibility that it should ever recover. We very much doubt if the time will not come, when the "Catholic" church will deeply regret the sanction it has given to this publication. It was shrewdly observed by Dr. Wordsworth, in his Letters to M. Gondon, that by the publication of his "Essay on Development," Dr. Newman had really committed a very grievous injury against the Church of Rome; that, so far from rejoicing over, she ought rather earnestly to deplore that publication. We firmly believe such to be the case now. As, in that instance, Dr. Newman has shut the door for ever against any appeal to Primitive antiquity, in support of the peculiar dogmas of the Romish Church; so, in the present case, he has cut the ground from under the feet of those persons who, like innocent Mr. Dodsworth, wish to exonerate their religion from the charge of "superstition;" he has, as we will show plainly enough ere this paper is finished, by his rash assertions respecting Romish miracles, done more than any man living to let in a flood of scepticism and infidelity. We honestly believe, spite of the *éclat* by which his slanders against the Church he has deserted have been hitherto received in the "Catholic" world, that Dr. Newman ought, if he had his real deserts, to be considered the evil genius of the Romish Communion.

Within the limits of a paper like this, it is obviously impossible that we can pretend to any thing like a critical and detailed examination of the whole of the Lectures; we can only touch upon a few of the most salient points; can only expose a few of the "errors" into which the writer has fallen.

And first, we would say a few words on the miserable sophistry by which Dr. Newman has endeavoured to throw dust in the eyes of the English people, to blind their judgments respecting the Jesuits.

"If," he says, "there is any set of men in the whole world who are railed against as the pattern of all that is evil, it is the Jesuit body. It is vain to ask their slanderers what they know of them; did they ever see a Jesuit? can they say whether they are many or few? what do they know of their teaching? 'Oh! it is quite notorious,' they reply;

'you might as well deny the sun in heaven; it is notorious that the Jesuits are a crafty, intriguing, unscrupulous, desperate, murderous, and exceedingly able body of men; a secret society, ever plotting against liberty, and government, and progress, and thought, and the prosperity of England. Nay, it is awful; they disguise themselves in a thousand shapes, as men of fashion, farmers, soldiers, labourers, butchers, and pedlers; they prowl about with handsome stocks, and stylish waistcoats, and gold chains about their persons, or in fustian jackets, as the case may be; and they do not hesitate to shed the blood of any one whatever, prince or peasant, who stands in their way.' Who can fathom the inanity of such statements? which are made, and therefore, I suppose, believed, not merely by the ignorant, but by educated men, who ought to know better, and will have to answer for their false witness. But all this is persisted in; and it is affirmed that they were found to be too bad for Catholic countries, the governments of which, it seems, in the course of the last century, forcibly obliged the Pope to put them down¹⁰."

By way of for ever clearing the Jesuit body of all the imputations against them, Dr. Newman has recourse to a notable expedient. He quotes a passage from Blanco White, exceedingly favourable to the Jesuit order, *as compared with the rest of the Spanish clergy*, in respect to morality, purity, the care of youth, &c. But now, nobody knows better than Dr. Newman, that the really grave part of the charge against the order has nothing whatever to do with the passage he quotes. No one, as far as we know, of any credit, has ever charged the Jesuits as a body with personal immorality. The charge made against them is not personal, but a charge against the principles of their order. The charge is twofold:—First, that their principles are utterly subversive of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and must end, if practically carried out, in the utter ruin of the Catholic Church of primitive times; and, secondly, not that they themselves are corrupt, but that, *if it suit their purpose*, they will connive at the grossest corruption, the most barefaced fraud, the most deceitful treachery, in those who are their instruments, in those by whom their designs may in anywise be advanced and forwarded. Dr. Newman knows perfectly well, that the damning facts on which these charges are based are matter of history; that they can no more be denied than the fact of his own existence. It has been well and truly observed, in a former number of this Review, that in reference to the first point,—

"The charges are not vague calumnies, or malignant rumours; but formal statements, founded on official documents, and substantiated by

¹⁰ Lectures, pp. 16, 17.

unimpeachable evidence before competent and impartial tribunals. And they are adduced here, not as the groundwork of an accusation against the system of Jesuitism (this must rest upon its internal *à priori* constitution), but as illustrations of its practical working—as a warning not to admit even in the hands of holy men, even with beginnings of harmlessness, a principle and an organization essentially and intrinsically at variance with the polity of the Church. Neither Ignatius in his theory, nor Xavier in his practice, are to be accused of deliberate rebellion against the ministers of the Church. Xavier himself, in his first missionary operations, conducted himself with exemplary deference to them. But the system itself was charged with the elements of faction. And the inevitable result was the laceration and almost destruction of the Church¹.”

And with regard to the second point, Mr. Scudamore, in his admirable “Letters to a Seceder,” has well observed that “the systems of morality by which they were directed in the confessional deliberately justified or palliated almost every crime of which man can be guilty.” Does Dr. Newman dispute this charge? We refer him to the description which one, who *used* to be somewhat regarded in the Church of Rome, before the “Essay on Development” was written, has left us of Jesuit principles; advising him, the next time he endeavours to defend the order, to apply himself to the real charges against them, not to those he invents himself for the purpose of chanting an *Io Pæan* over their fancied refutation.

“They have introduced,” says Fleury, “two methods, by which sin is permitted to reign: the one by excusing the majority of sins; the other, by facilitating absolution. It is taking away sin, at least in the opinion of men, to teach them that what they believed to be sin is not so; which is the thing that the modern doctors have undertaken to do by their distinctions and their scholastic subtleties, above all by the doctrine of probability.

“With respect to sins which it is impossible to excuse, the remedy is easy absolution, never refused, or even deferred, however frequent the relapses may be. The sinner thus finds himself well off, and does whatever he likes. By and by he is told that he is really sinning, but that the remedy is easy, and that he may sin every day, if he confess every day.

“This facility of absolution in some manner annihilates sin; inasmuch as it takes away the horror of it, and makes it looked upon as an ordinary and unavoidable evil. Would men fear the fever if, to cure it, nothing were needed but to swallow a glass of water? Would men fear to commit theft or murder, if they could get off by just washing their hands? Confession is a thing almost as easy, when there is nothing to be done but to say a word in a priest’s ear, without having to

¹ English Review, No. xviii. p. 424.

² P. 170.

fear either delay of absolution, or painful satisfaction, or being obliged to give up the occasion of it³."

But let us turn, next, to Dr. Newman's second lecture, "Tradition the sustaining power of the Protestant view." In this the writer chiefly spits his venom against the English Church, and to this therefore shall our special attention at once be directed. Let us, first, notice one very remarkable admission of Dr. Newman's. The "Catholic" religion, he tells us, is "ubiquitous, intellectual, energetic, efficient, and has remained one and the same for"—how long do our readers think? We know very well what date the old Doctors of the Romish Church would have assigned to the "Catholic" religion. They would have told us, without any hesitation, that, as it existed in their day, so was it in the primitive Church—that it was then as in the days of its Divine Founder and the holy Apostles. They would have said this, and said it falsely. But the author of the "Essay" does not venture to imitate the old Doctors. He knows perfectly well that he has "estopped" himself from taking this line; so he tells his hearers that the "Catholic" religion has remained "one and the same"—not from its foundation, but—"for centuries!" We thank Dr. Newman for the admission. It is consolatory to know that even the "new" religion has existed "for centuries." The writer tells us indeed, lower down, that "Catholicism" has existed as "a fact" for *fifteen* centuries; but, even then, there is a small matter of some three hundred years to account for, before his description of the "old" religion will tally with that of Bellarmine, Baronius, and the ancient worthies of the Romish Church. But this by the way. Well, then, Dr. Newman rakes up again the old slander, which we really thought had been buried by this time, by all respectable writers, about Henry VIII. He tells us that "Henry began a new religion," and then, moreover, that this "new religion" was by no means "national," could not for a moment "stand" by itself, but began, continued—we had almost said ended, but it has not *quite* come to that yet—by royal authority! The nation, as a nation, had nothing whatever to do with it. The Church of England, as a Church, had no voice in the matter at all. Henry "began" it, "Elizabeth brought it into shape," and royal patronage, and the fostering care of royal authority, has hitherto sustained it! Now we do seriously ask, what *can* be said of *Dr. Newman*, as the writer of this farrago of absurdity, except that he states a falsehood, knowing it to be one? He knows perfectly well that Henry VIII. had no more to do with founding the faith of the Church of England than the

³ Scudamore. Appendix, p. 323.

⁴ P. 42.

⁵ P. 52.

Emperor Constantine had to do with founding the Christianity of the fourth century. He knows perfectly well, that, to use the striking language of Sir Edward Sandys, in 1599,—

“The alteration which hath been in England, was brought in with peaceable and orderly proceeding, by general consent of the Prince and whole Realm representatively assembled in solemn Parliament, a great part of their own clergy according and conforming themselves unto it; no Luther, no Calvin the square of their faith: what public discussing and long deliberation did persuade them to be faulty, that taken away; the succession of Bishops and vocation of Ministers continued; the dignity and state of the Clergy preserved; the honour and solemnity of the service of God not abated; the more ancient usages of the Church not cancelled; in sum, no humour of affecting contrariety, but a charitable endeavour rather of conformity with the Church of Rome, in whatsoever they thought not gainsaying to the express law of God, which is the only approvable way in all meet reformations⁶.”

It would conduce very much more to the good fame and credit of Dr. Newman if he would condescend to imitate the noble candour of one of his co-religionists, who thus plainly contradicts his stale slander about Henry VIII. and the “new religion.”

“It is impossible,” says Mr. Pugin, “to peruse many of the most celebrated of the old authors of the English Church without being impressed with the fact that they never considered themselves as a newly-created body detached from the ancient Church, but as a strictly continuous succession of the ancient men, deprived of much of the ancient dignity of religion, differing in discipline and hampered by the state articles, but still the representatives of the old system. It is indeed remarkable that in no official act is the Church of England committed to the term ‘Protestant;’ it does not occur in the Liturgy, or any authoritative office, nor in the articles, or canons, and in the bidding-prayer she prays for the whole state of Christ’s Catholic Church, and especially for that part of it established in this dominion. Language which can admit of only one interpretation⁷.”

And let us see how far Dr. Newman is correct in describing the religion of England, the “Protestant” faith—we take his description, *valeat quantum valet*—as altogether dependent on royal patronage, and royal authority. He thus speaks on this point,—

“English Protestantism is the religion of the throne: it is represented, realized, taught, transmitted in the succession of monarchs and an hereditary aristocracy. It is religion grafted upon loyalty; and its strength is not in argument, not in fact, not in the unanswerable controversialist, not in an apostolical succession, not in sanction of Scripture, but in a royal road to faith, in backing up a King, whom

⁶ Scudamore, p. 227.

⁷ Ibid. p. 225.

men see, against a Pope they do not see. The devolution of its crown is the tradition of its creed; and to doubt its truth is to be disloyal towards its Sovereign^b."

And again—

"The Sovereign is the source and the centre, as of civil, so of ecclesiastical arrangements; truth shall be synonymous with order and good government;—what can be simpler than such a teaching? Puritans may struggle against it, and temporarily prevail; sceptics may ridicule it, object, expose, and refute; readers of the Fathers may strive to soften and embellish it with the colours of antiquity; but strong in the constitution of the law, and congenial to the heart of the people, the royal tradition will be a match for all its rivals, and in the long run will extinguish the very hope of competition^c."

Now we have charged Dr. Newman, in very plain terms, for we wish to speak plainly throughout this paper, with deliberately, not simply ignoring, but falsifying history for his own purposes. We repeat that charge now, and we will prove its truth.—"The devolution of its crown," he says, "is the tradition of its creed."—Let us see. Did Dr. Newman ever hear of a certain English Sovereign who *lost* his crown, not for being himself a Roman Catholic, but because he endeavoured to force Romanism on the English nation; because he thought proper to aim at the subversion of that Church of England, whose very existence, according to Dr. Newman, is dependent on the royal will and pleasure? JAMES THE SECOND "lost three kingdoms for a mass." James the Second thought fit to "back up" the Pope, and the consequence was that, so far from "backing up" the sovereign in his unrighteous attempt, the Protestant people of England drove him from his kingdom; ay, and more than that, they took very good care to secure themselves against being exposed, a second time, to a similar attempt, by securing the succession of the crown in a Protestant channel; and if ever any sovereign of this country, which God forbid, should imitate the attempt of James the Second to "back up" the Pope, a similar fate to that of James would assuredly befall him. So much for Dr. Newman and English history!

But we must give one instance, from this Lecture, of the cunning with which Dr. Newman has made up his case; of the artful manner in which he has contrived to intermingle cause and effect. He is describing a "distinct vehicle of the Protestant tradition in England," viz. the diffusion of knowledge and the consequent foundation of English literature.

"So it was," he says, "that about the commencement of the six-

^b Pp. 59, 60.

^c P. 61.

teenth century learning revived; on the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, the men of letters of the imperial city, and, what was of more consequence, its libraries, became the property of the West. . . . The revival began in Catholic Italy; it advanced into Catholic France; at length it showed itself in Protestant England. A voice came forth from the grave of the old world, as articulate and keen as that of a living teacher; and it thrilled into the heart of the people to whom it came, and it taught them to respond to it in their own tongue,—and that teaching was coincident with the first preaching of Protestantism¹."

Now, in our ignorance, we had hitherto ventured to imagine, that this "voice from the old world," this "teaching," of which the writer speaks, was something more than "*coincident* with the first preaching of Protestantism." In a measure, indeed, Dr. Newman's assertion is true enough. Doubtless the expulsion of James the Second was "*coincident*" with his attempts against the Church of England. Doubtless the *coup d'état* of the 2nd December was "*coincident*" with the elevation of Louis Napoleon to the dictatorship of the French nation; but what would be thought of the historian, who should venture so to describe these events? We rather apprehend that the "taking of Constantinople by the Turks," and the consequent diffusion of classical literature throughout Europe, was, not simply "*coincident with*," but was one very direct and principal *cause* of the Reformation. So long as the Romish doctors could appeal to the Primitive Fathers in support of their peculiar dogmas, and so long as scarcely any body was able to ascertain the truth or falsehood of their appeal, they had it all their own way. But the case was altered when the revival of classical learning had unfolded new sources of information on this point. South has truly said,—

"Satan played his papal game, chiefly in the time of ignorance, and sowed his tares while the world was asleep; *cum Augustinus haberetur inexpugnabilis dialecticus, quod legisset categorias Aristotelis. Cum qui Græcè sciret, suspectus; qui autem Hebraicè, planè magicus putaretur*; so, on the other side, when this mist of ignorance began to clear up, and polite learning to recover, and get footing again in the world, by the great ability and industry of Erasmus, Melancthon, Politius, Budæus, Calvin, and several others, men generally then began to smell out the cheat; and after a long growing suspicion of the imposture they had been held under, came at length to a resolution quite to throw it off²."

We must give one more extract before we leave our consideration of this Lecture:

"Here is the tradition of the Court, and of the Law, and of Society, and of Literature, strong in themselves, and acting on each other, and

¹ Pp. 65, 66.

² Sermons, II. p. 331.

acting on a willing people, and the willing people acting on them, till the whole edifice stands self-supported, reminding one of some vast arch, (as at times may be seen,) from which the supports have crumbled away by age, but which endures still, and supports the huge mass of brickwork which lies above it, by the simple cohesion of parts which that same age has effected. My Brothers of the Oratory, you see what I meant when I spoke of the tradition of the Pharisees, and said that it might be powerful in influence, though it was argumentatively weak ; you see why it is that the fair form of Catholicism, as it exists in the east, west, and south, never crosses the retina of a Protestant's imagination ; it is the incubus of this tradition which cumbers the land, and opposes an impregnable barrier between us and each individual Protestant whom we happen to address. Whoever he is, he thinks he knows all about our religion, before speaking to us ; nay, perhaps he knows it much better than we know it ourselves³."

Now we quote this passage with a twofold object. First, to express our most unfeigned agreement with the truth of the first part of it ; and, in the next place, to express our unbounded astonishment at the audacity which could produce the second. Dr. Newman is perfectly right in his assertion that " Protestantism" does " endure still," and will " endure still ;" not, indeed, because its " supports have crumbled away by age," but because those " supports" are daily receiving renewed strength and renewed vigour ; ay, even from the puny attacks which he, and such as he, are continually making against it. It does, indeed, stand, " a huge mass of brickwork" if he will, and the keystone of the arch is the love and affection which the people of England feel, in their inmost hearts, for that CHURCH OF ENGLAND which, Catholic beyond all others in her descent, in her doctrines, in her ministry, is prepared ever to " protest" against the tyranny and corruptions of the Romish Communion. Let Dr. Newman assure himself that *he* has no more chance of displacing one solitary fragment of that " huge mass," than he has of removing, by his own unassisted efforts, the Druid monuments on Salisbury Plain.

But what can we think of the audacity which can venture to tell us that we oppose " the fair form of Catholicism" from ignorance of its true character ? Why it is just because we are *not* ignorant of its true character that we oppose it so strenuously. Where is it, we ask Dr. Newman, that the " fair form of Catholicism" is to be found ? Is it amidst the " Ribondism" of unhappy Ireland ? Is it in Spain, or Italy, among a people debased by ignorance, and grovelling in superstition ; kept, deliberately kept, by their spiritual rulers in a state of darkness, which may well nigh be " felt ;" deprived of the light of God's own

³ Pp. 70, 71.

blessed Word, which they, who profess to be its divinely-appointed guardians, dare not disseminate among the laity, because they too well know the consequences of so doing? Is it in Naples, among the priestly adherents of a tyranny, against which all Europe, thanks to Mr. Gladstone, rings with execration? Is it in Tuscany, where, even now⁴, people are imprisoned by the civil power for the deadly crime of reading themselves, and encouraging others to read, that Word of God, which the primitive fathers every where diffused as His most gracious gift to a fallen world? Or is it in France, where we see her "fair form" crouching beneath the nod of a despot; ready to undergo any amount of humiliation; prepared to connive at the grossest perjury, the most barefaced robbery, ay, and what is worse, to share in the plunder⁵? No; let Dr. Newman thoroughly persuade himself, it is because we know Rome too well, that we will not trust her. It is because we know her to be, as he himself once described her, "a pitiless and unnatural relative;" an "enemy who will do us a mischief when she can;" because she is, "in truth, a Church beside herself—crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural;" because "she may be said to resemble a demoniac, ruled within by an inexorable spirit;" because she is "her real self only in name;" therefore is it, because of all these things, that "*till God vouchsafe to restore her, we must treat her as if she were that Evil One which governs her*"⁶.

There is one more passage which we will quote, as fully justifying an, apparently, harsh expression we lately used. We said that, in this second Lecture, Dr. Newman had more especially "spat his venom" against the Church of England. We simply quote the passage in question, without any comment, and then leave our readers to form their own opinion of the *animus* which pervades the whole course of Lectures.

"Protestantism is also the Tradition of the Anglican Clergy; and in speaking of them with reference to it, as I am going to speak, Brothers of the Oratory, do not suppose me to be forgetful either of their private worth, or their civil importance. As the other functions of the constitution subserve the temporal welfare of the community, so does the established clergy minister to it with a special fidelity. But I am all along speaking of Kings, Lords, Commons, Law, Literature, and so also of the Clergy, not simply as parts of the body politic, but as organs of Protestantism; and, as I have pointed out the office which other political ranks and departments fulfil in its propagation, so am I now to speak of the duties of the Religious Establishment. I say, then,

⁴ See English Review, for January, p. 475.

⁵ See Louis Napoleon's proposal to found a hospital for "decayed priests" from the Orleans property.

⁶ Newman's "Prophetic Office," pp. 103, 104.

that its especial duty as a religious body, is not to inculcate any particular theological system, but to watch over the anti-Catholic tradition, to preserve it from rust and decay, to keep it bright and keen, and ready for action on any emergency or peril. It is the way with human nature to start with vigour, and then to flag; years tell upon the toughest frames; time introduces changes; prejudices are worn away; asperities are softened; views open; errors are corrected; opponents are better understood; the mind wearies of warfare. The Protestant tradition, left to itself, would in the course of time languish and decline; laws would become obsolete, the etiquette and usages of society would alter, literature would be enlivened with new views, and the old Truth might return with the freshness of novelty. It is the special mission of the established clergy by word and writing to guard against this tendency of the public mind. In this mainly consists its teaching; I repeat, not in the shreds of Catholic doctrine which it professes, not in proofs of the divinity of any creed whatever, not in separating opinion from faith, not in instructing in the details of morals, but mainly in furbishing up the old-fashioned weapons of centuries back; in cataloguing and classing the texts which are to batter us, and the objections which are to explode among us, and the insinuations and the slanders which are to mow us down. The Establishment is the keeper in ordinary of those national types and blocks, from which Popery is ever to be printed off,—of the traditional view of every Catholic doctrine, the traditional account of every ecclesiastical event, the traditional lives of Popes and Bishops, abbots and monks, saints and confessors, the traditional fictions, sophisms, calumnies, mockeries, sarcasms, and invectives with which Catholics are to be assailed⁷."

We shall pass very briefly over Dr. Newman's third Lecture, "Fable the basis of the Protestant view;" one or two passages only require a slight examination. The writer tells us, as he is very fond of doing, that the existence of "Protestantism" among us depends entirely on the fact of its being the "*established* tradition."

"Fact and argument," he says, "are the tests of truth and error; Protestantism then has had an adventitious advantage in this country, in consequence of which it has not been tried (as in the course of years otherwise it would have been tried, and has been tried elsewhere) on its own merits. Instead then of concluding that it is true, because it has continued here during three centuries substantially the same, I should rather conclude that it is false, because it has not been able during that period to continue the same abroad. To the standing, compulsory Tradition existing here, I ascribe its continuance here; to fact and reason, operating freely elsewhere, I ascribe its disappearance elsewhere⁸."

Well now, there is one country, not quite unimportant among

⁷ Pp. 71, 72.

⁸ P. 81.

the nations, in which "fact and reason" have had full scope to "operate freely," and yet in which "Protestantism" has not quite "disappeared." If we may believe the accounts furnished by the Propagation Society, on the occasion of the recent Jubilee, "Protestantism" is not *quite* on its "last legs" on the American continent, and yet we have not yet heard that it is "established." For our own parts we pray God most earnestly, that the time may never come, when the connexion shall be severed, ay, even the *existing* connexion, with all its hardship, and all its one-sidedness, which has prevailed between "Church and State" in this country. Far better is it, because more consistent with her duty, that, if need be, the Church should "suffer in bonds," than, by any act on her part, do any thing by which the State shall be unchristianized. But, if the time should ever come, when *other hands than her own* shall sever this connexion, Dr. Newman may depend on it that the English Church will flourish none the less because not "established." With the glorious example of the American episcopate before us, we need have no fear that English "Protestantism" will "disappear," even though deprived of the fostering influence of state patronage and royal authority.

We pass over Dr. Newman's notable discovery that the "Times" newspaper is the great "Protestant" bulwark in England; but we must make a few remarks on the occasion of his saying so. The writer falls foul of the "Times" for stating that, in Romish countries, a table of crimes is set up with the price of their absolution over against them. He tries very hard to mystify the question by a cloud of words respecting "confusion between the *forgiveness of sins* and *admission to Church communion*." But does Dr. Newman mean to deny, in plain terms, that the practice to which the "Times" refers ever existed in the Church of Rome? He must be a bolder man, if he does, than even the veracious Milner. Let us see what Mr. Scudamore can tell us on this point. We quote from the valuable Appendix to his "Letters to a Seceder."

"II. Rate Books of the Papal Penitentiary :—

"An official list, which fixed the price of absolution for various crimes, and of dispensations by which those who had committed them were made capable of acquiring, or retaining, spiritual offices, was long in use in the Church of Rome, under the name of *Taxæ Sacræ Pœnitentiariæ Apostolicæ*. According to Polydore Vergil (lib. viii. c. ii. fol. m. 487), Benedict XII. (1334—1342) was the first Pope who drew, or caused them to be drawn up. The last *Papal* edition was issued by Leo X., in 1514; since which time it has been frequently reprinted."

And again—

“ To show the light in which these enormities were viewed by well-informed and earnest members of the Church of Rome, I subjoin an extract made by Mr. Mendham from the writings of Claude D’Espense, a zealous Roman Catholic in the sixteenth century, described by Dupin (see his *Eccl. Hist. Eng. Trans.* 1706, cent. xvi. B. V. pp. 100—106) as ‘one of the most learned and judicious doctors of his time;’ and by De Thou (lib. xvi. ad ann. 1555) as being too good to be made a cardinal, for which honour Paul IV. had once intended him :—

“ ‘ It is wonderful that, at this time, in this schism, there has been no suppression of a book which is as an index of so many, so foul and fearful crimes, an index of a character so infamous, that I do not believe there is a work before the public that gives more scandal than this in Germany, Switzerland, and wherever they have revolted from the see of Rome: and so far is it from being suppressed by the favourers of the Church of Rome, that licences and impunities for crimes of such magnitude and character are, to a considerable extent, renewed and confirmed in the faculties of the legates who come thence hither, by which they are enabled to instate in privileges, in spite (God willing) of whatever fatal disqualification, and not only to absolve, but to give dispensations for orders, preferments, dignities, and all benefices whatever, in any number, of whatsoever kind, to illegitimate children, whatever the degree of the sin that gave them birth, (not forgetting those who have polluted themselves with adultery, that they may be able to marry,) to men guilty of perjury, of simony, of forgery likewise, of rape, of usury, of schism, of heresy, (provided they have come to their senses,) to men guilty of murder,—only casual or involuntary, for the former Tax-table did not except even wilful murder,—to priest-killers, to parricides, matricides, to slayers of brother, sister, wife, or infant, to witches, sorceresses, keepers of concubines, adulterers, &c. &c. Let Rome at length feel shame, and cease to expose to public infamy a catalogue, so impudent, of every species of crime.’—Comm. in Ep. ad Tit. c. i. v. 7, Paris, 1568, pp. 67, 68.—Opp. Lutet. Par. 1619, p. 479.

“ Such a testimony as this makes it quite impossible to suppose, as the enormity of the case might incline us to hope, that a mistake has been made as to the meaning of these lists. It may be well to mention, however, that they formed the subject (understood as we understand them) of one of the ‘Hundred Grievances of the German Nation,’ presented to the Pope by the Diet of Nuremberg, in 1522, an assembly professing obedience to the Pope, and holding Roman Catholic doctrine. Will it be believed, then, *that more than one recent controversialist has had the front to insinuate doubt, and suggest deceitful explanation respecting the *Taxæ Pœnitentiariæ* in the following style?—*

“ ‘ In case there was the least real groundwork for this vile book, *which I cannot find there was*, the money paid into the Papal Chancery (it should be *Penitentiary*) could be nothing else but the *fees of office* on restoring certain culprits to the *civil privileges* which they had

forfeited by their crimes.'—Milner's *End of Controversy*, Let. xli. note i. ed. 1824¹."

We pass on to consider Dr. Newman's fourth Lecture, "True testimony unequal to the Protestant view." The writer takes different ground here. He does not venture to deny the existence of evil within the "Catholic" Church, but he endeavours to show that, at all events, we "Protestants" have no right to "throw stones," because the material of our own houses is equally brittle. It is not quite a case of "lying," in the present instance, but merely of ill-natured slander, which Dr. Newman meets with a *tu quoque*. Let us see how far his answer is a good one.

"All this," he says, *i. e.* the existence of bad popes, bishops, priests, &c. &c., "all this may be granted, but before the admission can avail as an argument against the Catholic Church, one thing has to be examined, whether on the whole her influence and her action is on the side of what is wrong, or rather (as is the case) simply powerful on the side of good; one thing has to be proved, that the scandals within her pale have been caused by her principles, her teaching, her injunctions, or, which pretty nearly comes to the same thing, that they do not exist, and as grievously (Catholics would say, they exist far more grievously) external to her²."

Now the particular instance in which Dr. Newman challenges his opponents to join issue with him, is the existence, or non-existence, of a *greater amount* of impurity from the vow of celibacy taken by the Romish clergy. He admits, in a degree, the existence of the impurity, but explains it by a twofold argument. First, he denies that there is any "special grace of purity" in married priests, and therefore argues that *we* have no right to declaim against the vow of celibacy. Secondly, he asserts that the evil referred to arises, not from the vow of celibacy in anywise, but from corrupt human nature, which will break out alike in "Catholics" and "Protestants." That we may not misstate him, we will give his own words.

"Purity is not a virtue which comes as a matter of course to the married any more than to the single, though of course there is great difference between man and man; and though it is impossible to bring the matter fairly to an issue, yet for that very reason I have as much a right to my opinion as another to his, when I state my deliberate conviction that there are, to say the least, as many offences against the marriage vow among Protestant ministers, as there are against the vow of celibacy among Catholic Priests. . . .

"But if matrimony does not prevent cases of immorality among Protestant ministers, it is not celibacy which causes them among Ca-

¹ Pp. 302—304.

² P. 126.

tholic Priests. It is not what the Catholic Church imposes, but what human nature prompts, which leads any portion of her ecclesiastics into sin. Human nature will break out, like some wild and raging element, under any system ; it bursts out under the Protestant system ; it bursts out under the Catholic ; passion will carry away the married clergyman as well as the unmarried priest. On the other hand there are numbers to whom there would be, not greater, but less trial in the vow of celibacy, than in the vow of marriage³."

And again—the writer is discussing Blanco White's account of Spanish nunneries :—

"Here is little more than what happens every day in England; for I suppose that here in England there are secret unbelievers, and men who are fair and smooth, but inwardly corrupt, and many a single female wasted by weariness and sadness, and many a married woman cursing the day she ever took her vow; for these things must be, though they ought not to be, while the nature of man is the same⁴."

Now, it is scarcely possible to suppose that so acute a writer as Dr. Newman did not himself see the glaring fallacy on which his argument is based. Waiving, as beside our purpose, all question as to *comparative* "purity," we say, confidently, that there is a very material difference between the two cases. A married priest commits the sin of impurity, in its worst sense. Well, he does so through the influence of the evil spirit, acting on his own corrupt nature. But, in his case, there are no especial superinducements to sin. God Himself instituted the "holy estate of matrimony," and the Church of England dares not impose a yoke on her members which God has not imposed. She dares not impugn that Christian liberty, which the great Apostle of the Gentiles claimed permission to exercise, if he thought fit to do so. If, therefore, the married priest sins, the crime is altogether his own, and no responsibility attaches to the Church. *She* has never strained frail humanity beyond its powers of endurance. *She* has never, by any act of hers, exposed her priests to any temptations besides those which are *common to man*. But this is exactly what the Church of Rome has done. She *imposes* on her priesthood a yoke which God has not imposed. She *forces*, she runs directly counter to, the natural feelings of humanity ; and she thereby renders herself directly responsible, not, undoubtedly, for every instance of impurity in a priest, but, surely, for every *single* instance in which the vow of celibacy has been, in any wise, the *cause* of falling into temptation, of committing actual sin. If Dr. Newman means to deny altogether that the vow of celibacy ever has been the *especial cause* of the

³ Pp. 129, 130.

⁴ Pp. 151, 152.

sin of impurity, of course with him we cease to argue. We must simply refer to the melancholy facts which ecclesiastical history presents to us. We submit, on the other hand, confidently, that, supposing the vow of celibacy to have been in anywise such a cause, then is the Church which dares, in defiance of God's law, of Christian liberty, and of human nature, to impose that vow on her priesthood, directly responsible, in the sight of God and man, for every act of sin so committed. So strong, in truth, is our conviction on this point, that we should be inclined, reasoning *à priori*, to draw a marked distinction between a sin of this kind, committed by a Romish priest, and a similar act committed by a priest of the English Communion. We should feel, *primâ facie*, a certain amount of pity for the one, while condemning him. We should feel for the other nothing but unmitigated anger and disgust. In the case of the Romish priest, we should feel that, but for the accursed, unnatural yoke his Church had imposed on him, he might *possibly* have kept himself free from the dominion of sin; that his guilt *might*, therefore, admit of palliation; that it *might* have happened that, but for the imposition of that yoke, he *might* have lived and died without the stain of impurity attaching to his name. We submit, then, if our argument be good for any thing, that we have answered Dr. Newman's challenge.

"If," he says, "grievous sin is found in holy places, the Church cannot hinder it, while man is man: prove that she encourages it, prove that she does not repress it, prove that her action, be it greater or less, is not, as far as it goes, beneficial;—then, and not till then, will you have established a point against her⁵."

We submit confidently that, so far as the vow of celibacy is concerned, whether that vow apply to man or woman, we have "established a point" against the Church of Rome.

While on this subject, we cannot refrain from laying before our readers the admirable reply of Archdeacon Stopford to Dr. Marshall; a reply which, for acuteness, has rarely been excelled. Dr. Marshall, in his sermon at Kells, gave as one of his reasons for leaving the Church of England, that she had no "holy virginity." Let us hear the archdeacon's reply:—

"But we have no holy virginity. It was for this distinguished merit of virginity (you said) that St. John was specially exalted above all the other Apostles as 'the beloved disciple.' For this you gave no proof, and I know not where to find any. But suppose I take it on your statement, I must conclude that St. John only was a virgin. Surely you cannot mean to say that if all, or one-half of the twelve

Apostles had the *same* virginity as St. John, that our Saviour would have exalted him so highly above all the other virgins, solely on account of his virginity. Your story, therefore, proves that there was but one virgin among the twelve Apostles. That among twelve Apostles, Christ chose eleven married men; rather a strange way of recommending virginity among the clergy. Why should not we, as you said in your sermon, 'without a blush,' have married men among our clergy, after such a proof that virginity was so rare among the Apostles⁶?"

In his fifth Lecture, "Logical inconsistency of the Protestant view," Dr. Newman continues his *tu quoque* argument, and applies it to two particular instances, "image worship," and "persecution." Perhaps our readers are not aware that they have been living all their lives in direct and open violation of the second commandment! Yet so it is, according to Dr. Newman. They have actually been, all their lives through, practising idolatry, without knowing it! "A Protestant," says this learned and candid writer, "blames Catholics for showing honour to images; *yet he does it himself*."⁷ He endeavours to prove this in two ways, first indirectly, and then directly. Protestants "dishonour" images, says Dr. Newman, and therefore they at once allow, by that very act of dishonour, that they may properly be "honoured," in the Romish sense of the word!

"Where," he says, "is the good sense of showing dishonour, if it is stupid and brutish to show honour? Approbation and criticism, praise and blame go together⁸."

But how do we "Protestants" *dishonour* images? Oh, we burn "bishops, or cardinals, or popes *in effigy*."⁹ "After preaching against the Catholic, who crowns an image of the Madonna, the Protestant goes his way, and sets light to an image of Guy Fawkes!!" And how then, triumphantly asks this admirable logician, "is it *childish* to honour an image, if it is not *childish* to dishonour it?" One would really suppose, from the words of the writer, that the English clergy were as fond of "burning," as D. C. L. and the "Morning Chronicle" are of "badgering" a bishop! We doubt not, if these Birmingham Lectures are ever translated into Italian, the Italians will fully believe, that the Archbishop of Canterbury, after convening a solemn assembly of the clergy of his province, "preached" at St. Paul's against "Papal Aggression," and then, attended by his suffragans and a long train of applauding presbyters, to say nothing of the lord mayor, aldermen, and sheriffs of the city of London, went in grand procession to Clapham Common, and

⁶ Letter, &c. p. 16.

⁷ P. 171.

⁸ P. 172.

⁹ Sic.

burnt "*in effigy*" Pio Nono and Cardinal Wiseman! Such, however, is one way by which we "Protestants" admit the principle of "showing honour to images!"

Oh, but we are not to get off so lightly as this. We are not only idolaters virtually, but really and actually, "But," gravely maintains Dr. Newman, "this is not all; Protestants *actually set up images to represent their heroes*¹, and they show them honour without any misgiving:" *argal*, we are quite as much idolaters as "Catholics." The statue of King William was set up on College-green, Dublin, and therefore we "Protestants" are "estopped" from saying one word against Romish *worship* of images! Now we really cannot insult our readers by seriously arguing the question of image-worship with Dr. Newman *on such grounds as these*. We content ourselves with one admission which, possibly, he may consider important. On certain days in the year the august assemblage to which we have just referred, and also her Majesty's judges, do attend at St. Paul's for solemn worship. Well now, whenever Dr. Newman shall inform the world, that *he has seen with his own eyes*, for on this point we will take no hearsay testimony, the archbishops, bishops, judges, lord mayor, aldermen, and sheriffs, deliberately *kneel down and worship* the images of Chatham, or Pitt, or Lord Nelson, or any other of the images to which we delight in "showing honour," as the pope, cardinals, bishops, and priests of Rome, *do* kneel down and *worship* the image of St. Peter; then, and not till then, will we allow that, *on Dr. Newman's grounds*, "Protestants" have no right whatever to object to the worship of images in the Romish Church. Meantime we leave our readers to say on which side, ours or Dr. Newman's, is the greater amount of "logical inconsistency."

And turn we now to the question of "persecution," respecting which Dr. Newman talks well nigh as much nonsense as about "image-worship," though not quite of such a barefaced character. We declare solemnly, that we earnestly deplore the necessity of speaking in this strain of one, who has heretofore acquired so high a reputation as the writer of these "Lectures." But we do say that, if his last "argument," save the mark! respecting "Protestant" image-worship be not a specimen of the most unadulterated nonsense, that ever emanated from the brain of mortal man, then we know not the meaning of terms. If "Catholics" of education and discernment can seriously eulogize it as likely to promote their cause in the estimation of thinking men, we can only say that we most sincerely wish them joy of their champion.

¹ The italics are our own.

Dr. Newman's argument with respect to "Protestant persecution" has a twofold relation, first, private, and then public; as it is practised by individuals, and by the state. He maintains, that we are quite as much amenable to the charge as they are, because if one of his children, or one of his servants, should be perverted to Romanism, a "Protestant" at once takes measures for the prevention of further mischief, by removing the offender from his family. But now any man with common sagacity will see at once that this is not "persecution," but self-preservation. It is a feeling dictated, not by a desire for punishment, but for prevention. Take an analogous case. A member of a household falls sick with an infectious fever. Well now, if he be wise, the head of that household will, if possible, remove the patient; at all events, he draws a cordon round his apartment, and debars him from all intercourse with the rest of the family. But does he thereby "persecute" the sick man? Surely not. He knows perfectly well that, if he does not take these precautions, *the fever will spread*, and probably destroy others, and he takes these measures in self-defence. Just so it is, and just so it ought to be, with "Protestants" in the circumstances Dr. Newman mentions. They know perfectly well, witness Mr. Gordon's atrocious conduct at Trinity College, Glenalmond, that "Catholics" will leave no means untried, right or wrong, fair or unfair, honourable or dishonourable, to spread their religion in a family; and therefore, surely, every conscientious "Protestant" parent or master is bound, on the common principles of human nature, to do precisely that which Dr. Newman ridicules him for doing. We say at once that, if "Catholics" under similar circumstances, did no more than this, we should, in this respect, find no fault whatever with them. But this is not all they do, as Dr. Newman perfectly well knows. How does the "fair form of Catholicism" treat those persons who venture to think for themselves, and abjure, or attempt to abjure, Romish errors? Let the dungeons of Spain and Italy—let the Dragonnades of Louis Quatorze—let the "Revocation of the Edict of Nantes," supply an answer to the question. Ay, and how do "Catholics" act in modern times? Let the civil process in the courts of Florence, to which we referred before, say whether domestic "persecution" is the only evil attendant, at the present day, on the exercise of the right of private judgment in "Catholic" Italy. It is, we submit, mere simple folly, for Dr. Newman to draw any analogy whatever between "Catholic" and "Protestant" persecution in the instances referred to.

And this is a favourable occasion to say a few words on a subject, at the present time, unhappily, of considerable import-

ance, viz. how ought those persons to be regarded and treated who have seceded from our communion? We are speaking, of course, generally, irrespective of local ties, or particular cases. Now we do not hesitate to say, that we have a very decided opinion on this point, and one with which, perchance, some of our readers may not agree at first sight. While we trust that it is our earnest desire to be "in charity with all men;" while, in opportunities of doing good, we would make no distinction of creed or party; we still must say that, in our judgment, *apart from these occasions*, any intercourse between ourselves and Romish "perverts" ought to be of the most distant character possible. It had better not exist at all; but, at all events, it ought to be, we think, simply of a formal nature. Our readers will remember a certain correspondence, to which we shall refer further presently, between Dr. Newman and the Bishop of Norwich. They will remember the friendly style in which that correspondence was commenced—"My dear Lord," and "My dear Newman." We recollect that the "Guardian," and we think the "Daily News," referred to this correspondence as "refreshing." They described it as a sort of "oasis" of amenity, amidst the "desert" of controversial asperity. We deeply regret that we cannot coincide in this opinion. Rather we did, at the time, lament exceedingly that any Bishop of the English Church could feel himself justified, in adopting such a tone, towards one who has so malignantly slandered the Church of which "God has made him an overseer," as Dr. Newman, since his perversion, has slandered the Church of England. But, apart from this particular case, what is the position towards the Church of England, of these "perverts," and especially those in Holy Orders? We apprehend that they are in the position of traitors, who have raised the banner of civil war against their lawful sovereign. Let us explain our meaning by a case somewhat parallel. We can easily understand that, during the Peninsular campaigns the English and French armies might soften the asperities of warfare, by a modified degree of intercourse during a temporary truce. But we could *not* understand the Spanish army taking such a course towards their enemies. The French were invading their country, and so long as one Frenchman remained on the Spanish territory, so long must there have been "war to the knife" between the Spanish people and their invaders. And so during the "Great Rebellion," we confess we could not appreciate the maudlin sentiment, which could allow a loyal-hearted Cavalier to fraternize, in any way or shape whatever, *save in offices of Christian charity*, with a traitor, fighting against his lawful sovereign. We submit that, *mutatis mutandis*, the case

Dr. Newman's argument with respect to "Protestant persecution" has a twofold relation, first, private, and then public; as it is practised by individuals, and by the state. He maintains, that we are quite as much amenable to the charge as they are, because if one of his children, or one of his servants, should be perverted to Romanism, a "Protestant" at once takes measures for the prevention of further mischief, by removing the offender from his family. But now any man with common sagacity will see at once that this is not "persecution," but self-preservation. It is a feeling dictated, not by a desire for punishment, but for prevention. Take an analogous case. A member of a household falls sick with an infectious fever. Well now, if he be wise, the head of that household will, if possible, remove the patient; at all events, he draws a cordon round his apartment, and debars him from all intercourse with the rest of the family. But does he thereby "persecute" the sick man? Surely not. He knows perfectly well that, if he does not take these precautions, *the fever will spread*, and probably destroy others, and he takes these measures in self-defence. Just so it is, and just so it ought to be, with "Protestants" in the circumstances Dr. Newman mentions. They know perfectly well, witness Mr. Gordon's atrocious conduct at Trinity College, Glenalmond, that "Catholics" will leave no means untried, right or wrong, fair or unfair, honourable or dishonourable, to spread their religion in a family; and therefore, surely, every conscientious "Protestant" parent or master is bound, on the common principles of human nature, to do precisely that which Dr. Newman ridicules him for doing. We say at once that, if "Catholics" under similar circumstances, did no more than this, we should, in this respect, find no fault whatever with them. But this is not all they do, as Dr. Newman perfectly well knows. How does the "fair form of Catholicism" treat those persons who venture to think for themselves, and abjure, or attempt to abjure, Romish errors? Let the dungeons of Spain and Italy—let the Dragonnades of Louis Quatorze—let the "Revocation of the Edict of Nantes," supply an answer to the question. Ay, and how do "Catholics" act in modern times? Let the civil process in the courts of Florence, to which we referred before, say whether domestic "persecution" is the only evil attendant, at the present day, on the exercise of the right of private judgment in "Catholic" Italy. It is, we submit, mere simple folly, for Dr. Newman to draw any analogy whatever between "Catholic" and "Protestant" persecution in the instances referred to.

And this is a favourable occasion to say a few words on a subject, at the present time, unhappily, of considerable import-

first principles they expect no *encouragement* of the kind. But they say this, "You come canting and whining to us; or, rather, you used to come, about 'Toleration.' Well, we give you that toleration. You issue a prospectus for a Roman cathedral on English ground; but if your principles of 'toleration' are good for any thing, we have as much right, in the nature of things, to build a 'Protestant' Church within the city of Rome, as you can have to build one here; and unless you allow the one, you have no right, on any principle of justice, to ask for the other." This is the "Protestant" argument, and it is a sound argument; ay, and we take the liberty of telling Dr. Newman, that he had better not say too much about what "Protestants can't" and "are not able" to do. If toleration is really to mean supremacy, if it is to be all on one side, if our forbearance is to be so despised, our sense of justice so requited, Dr. Newman may depend on it that, at the next election, the English people will send representatives to the Commons House of Parliament, pledged to a very different line of conduct. If the Emancipation Act of '29 be ever altered, if the Maynooth grant be ever rescinded, it will be attributable, not to the innate wish of the British nation, but to the arrogance and the impudence of Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Newman, and their Romish followers.

One word with respect to the mention made in these Lectures of one whom the Romish organs absurdly call the "Protestant Champion,"—we allude to Dr. Achilli. Before these pages meet the eyes of our readers, in all probability the action, now pending against Dr. Newman at the suit of Achilli, will have been decided one way or the other. On that subject we have nothing whatever to say. But we wish to point out this, that, whichever way the cause be decided, the damage, not to Dr. Newman personally, but to the "fair form of Catholicism," must be equally great. For just consider,—if Dr. Newman's charges be true, the case, on his own showing, amounts to this, that Dr. Achilli lived, from 1826 to over 1840, in the habitual, open, manifest, practice of the grossest; the most horrible crimes, being *all that time an ordained Priest of the Romish Church*. Dr. Newman admits, over and over again, that the Romish authorities did their best to "conceal" these things from the eyes of the public. They did *not* expel the offender from their pale, they did *not* degrade him from the priesthood, but they actually, in practice, connived at those enormous crimes. Could the deadliest enemy of the Romish Church bring against her a more damning accusation? We trow not. Take Dr. Newman's own words: he says that Achilli, "so early as 1826, was deprived—for an offence which his superiors did their best to conceal"—of what? of his "faculty to lecture!" He

says that, in 1827, Achilli had "already earned the reputation of a scandalous friar." Then he recounts three more abominations, committed during the next seven years; adding, that the delinquent "was afterwards found guilty of sins, *similar or worse*, in other towns of the neighbourhood." Next he mentions three other distinct offences of the same horrible character, committed during the next six years. Why, who does not see that, granting these charges to be perfectly true, Dr. Newman proves too much. He irretrievably convicts the Church of Rome of allowing all these abominations—till what time? Till Dr. Achilli "began to speak against, not only the Catholic faith but the moral law, and perverted others by his teaching!" Then it was, *and not till then*, that the Inquisition began its work. Why, is not the inference unavoidable, that Achilli, provided he had not begun to "speak against the Catholic faith," might have "heaped Ossa upon Olympus, and Pelion on Ossa;" might have steeped himself in crime of the blackest dye, "from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot," and his spiritual superiors have "made no sign?" If, therefore, Dr. Achilli be innocent, then has Dr. Newman committed a grievous "crime;" but, in any case, he has committed an atrocious "blunder," for which we suspect *his* superiors will not much thank him. Victory will, doubtless, be gratifying to himself personally, but, to the Romish Church, on his own showing, it will be scarcely less damaging than the most ignominious defeat. Achilli *may be* the "Cannæ" of Dr. Newman, but he must assuredly be, in any case, the "Capua" of the *Church of Rome*³.

But now let us see how Dr. Newman convicts "Protestantism" of the crime of "persecution;" though, by the way, "persecution" is, in his eyes, scarcely a crime: it is rather, to use his own words, "a principle which the Creator has put into our breasts," and which, therefore, is not to be altogether "ignored." The author of the "Continuous Confutation" has well argued on this admission.—

"Nor," he says, "does Dr. Newman himself hesitate to maintain the principle, as is implied in the following significant words: 'I say it boldly and decidedly, and do not flinch from the avowal, Protestants attempt too much, and they end in doing nothing. They go too far; they attempt what is against nature, and therefore impossible. . . . Their doctrine

³ P. 198.

⁴ Since writing the above we have carefully perused Dr. Wiseman's article on Achilli in the "Dublin Review." It fully and completely justifies our comments on Dr. Newman. Take one instance: In 1835, mark the date, Achilli, even then, "a man of known depravity," was "most unhappily appointed prior of a convent in Naples, *always in the hope of reclaiming him.*" (Dublin Review, June 1850, p. 486.)

of private judgment, as they hold it, is extreme and unreal. . . . They are attempting to reverse nature, with no warrant for doing so. They altogether ignore a principle which the Creator has put into our breasts. . . . Far other is the wisdom of the Church. . . . She must head a movement which it is impossible to suppress.' Dr. Newman is here speaking, it will be remembered, of that principle in our *evil and unregenerate nature* which expresses itself in acts of persecution whenever the power to persecute is possessed. This evil principle is then, on his own admission, an integral part of the system of Rome. It has been expressed in her official acts; it is fostered by oaths; it is a part of herself; it is a feature engrained in her. The utmost that her vindicators can accomplish is to palliate the expression of it, by showing that there was in individuals the will to check its operation. The power to do this herself Rome has resigned. She claims to be unchangeable in creed and structure. She cannot, therefore, surrender any principle to which, as in this instance, she is formally committed, without forfeiting her high pretensions. She must 'head a movement which it is impossible to repress.' She must do evil that good may come. She must act on a principle which she cannot disavow. Instead of probing the wounds of her corruptions, she allows them to sink deeper, and to spread wider, till they become engrained in her. And what must the result of such a reckless course be but that, at the last 'from the sole of the foot even unto the head there will be found no soundness in her;' the once 'faithful city' will have become the 'Harlot'?"

But be this as it may, let us see how the writer substantiates his *tu quoque* in this case. He thus ventures to "whitewash" the reputation of the Romish See. "Such conduct," the exercise, that is, of mildness and mercy,

"Such conduct is but in accordance with the historical character of the Holy See, in all times and in all countries. Doubtless in the long course of eighteen hundred years, there are events which need explanation, or which the world might wish otherwise: but the general tenor and tendency of the traditions of the Papacy have been mercy and humanity. It has ever been less fierce than the nations, and in advance of the age: it has ever moderated, not only the ferocity of barbarians, but the fanaticism of Catholic populations. Let the accusations which can be made against it be put in form; let the formal charges be proved; let the proved offences be counted up; and then Protestants themselves will be able to determine what judgment is to be passed on the language in which they indulge themselves against it."

Now, thanks to the most valuable "Letter" of Archdeacon Stopford, we can give Dr. Newman a little information on this particular point:—

¹ Continuous Confutation, pp. 36, 37.

² Newman's Lectures on Catholicism in England, p. 203.

“Consider,” he says, “the multitudes burned by the Inquisition in Spain: these were not Protestants. Most of them were ‘Catholics,’ *suspected* of thinking differently from what the Church of Rome thinks. Portugal, the Netherlands, and many other countries, tell the same tale. What of the 60,000 Protestants murdered together in Paris, on St. Bartholomew’s Eve? What of those who perished under the Inquisition at Goa, in India? From East to West we track her steps in blood.

“One case I will give more fully, for a reason I will tell: the case of the Albigenses, a people widely spread over the south of France, in the thirteenth century, before the Reformation—where, mark, it was not the Reformation that introduced such scenes.

“It is calculated that of this people 100,000 persons suffered death by fire and sword. Whole countries were desolated, and, except in the recesses of the mountains, the whole people were exterminated. Who can estimate the fearful amount of human suffering on the one side, and human crime upon the other, that was caused by the authors of that massacre’?”

“Oh, but,” perhaps Dr. Newman will say, “this was all the act of the civil power, against the wish of the ‘fair form of Catholicism.’”—Was it? Let us see.

“Mark, now,” says the Archdeacon again, “by what authority and by whose command this deed was done.

“A pope and a general council had joined in passing this law:—

“We excommunicate and anathematize *every heresy* which exalts itself against this holy, orthodox, and catholic faith, which we have expounded above: condemning *all heretics*, by whatever names they may be censured. . . .

“3. Let the secular powers be admonished, and induced, and, *if necessary, let them be compelled by ecclesiastical censures*, whatever offices they fill, that as they desire to be reputed and counted faithful, they publicly take an oath for the defence of the faith; *that in sincerity, to the utmost of their strength, they will apply themselves to EXTERMINATE* from the lands subject to their jurisdiction, *all heretics denounced by the Church.* * * * But if the temporal lord required and admonished by the Church, shall have neglected to purge his land from this stain of heresy, let him be bound with the chain of excommunication by the metropolitan and the other provincial bishops; and if he shall have despised to make satisfaction, within a year, let this be signified to the supreme pontiff, that then he (the pope) *may pronounce* the vassals (or subjects) absolved from allegiance to him (the lord), *and may expose his lands to the Catholics*, who shall possess it, *THE HERETICS BEING EXTERMINATED*, without any contradiction, and preserve it in purity of faith; the right of the lord in chief being saved provided he offer no impediment, nor oppose any obstacle. • • •

’ Letter to Dr. Marshall, pp. 25, 26.

"4. But let the Catholics who, *the sign of the cross being taken, shall have girded themselves to exterminating the heretics*, enjoy those indulgences, and let them be fortified with that holy privilege which is conceded to those who go to the defence of the Holy Land. * * *

"The privileges thus given by *the pope and a general council*, consisted in the special protection of the Holy See for the goods and properties of the 'Catholics' while engaged in the massacre; and deliverance from purgatory and immediate admission to the glory of Heaven for all who might be killed in executing the vengeance of the Church upon the heretics.

"This law was passed in the year 1215, by Pope Innocent III., and the fourth Council of Lateran; a council acknowledged by Roman Catholics as a general council, and infallible.

"It was in pursuance of this law, and others of the same nature, that the Albigenses were 'exterminated' by a general massacre."

Well may we say to Dr. Newman, as the Archdeacon eloquently said to Dr. Marshall:—

"I do not ask you, sir, whether this horrible doctrine—teaching and enforcing wholesale murder, as a duty of religion and of the Gospel of Christ—I do not ask you whether it be 'from heaven, or of men;' but I do ask you *whether this be any thing else than Hell itself let loose upon the earth in the name of the Church of Christ*."

Oh, but even then, *we* have no right to throw stones. "Protestants" are as bad, if not worse, than Romanists, in this respect. "Protestantism" has ever been a "persecuting power." "Calvin burnt a Socinian, Cranmer an Anabaptist." Luther did one thing—Knox did something else,—Romish priests were horribly tortured in the reign of James the First, &c. &c.; and, therefore, "one would think that with scandals such as these at their door, Protestants would find it safest to let history alone, and not meddle with the question of persecution at all, *from a lively consciousness of deeds identical with those which they impute to the Catholic Church*." The answer is obvious. First, Dr. Newman's assertion as to "identity" is not true, and he knows it. Secondly, the particular acts to which he refers have been universally condemned and not justified; and, thirdly, "Protestantism," as such, is, in no way whatever, answerable for them. Calvin burnt Servetus. True, he did so, and what was the consequence? That that *one* isolated transaction has been, ever since, the plague-spot of Calvin's history, the blot in his escutcheon which the most favourable of his biographers cannot obliterate. Cranmer burnt an Anabaptist. Well, let Dr. Newman show us one of Cranmer's biographers, or, indeed, any writer of eminence, who maintains

* Letter to Dr. Marshall, pp. 26—28.

° P. 28.

that Cranmer, in so doing, acted simply "in accordance with a principle which his Creator had put into his breast," and which, therefore, ought not to be "ignored," and we will, at once, allow the analogy to hold good. Cranmer acted, moreover, *upon the law*, but did not make it. The Church of Rome made the law, and then acted upon it,—rather a material difference, though, of course, not sufficient to justify Cranmer's severity. And, as to the execution of the priests in James the First's reign, "Protestantism," as such, as Dr. Newman very well knows, had no more to do with it, than the Church of Spain, at the moment we are writing, has had to do with the "garotting" of the Spanish priest, who attempted the life of his sovereign. They were executed, not as Romanists, but as traitors. And does Dr. Newman inquire, who was really responsible for the death of these men? We tell him the Bishop of Rome, and no one else: yes, and we prove our assertion, thanks to Archdeacon Stopford, by the evidence of an enlightened Roman Catholic. Mark, we do not mean responsible, indirectly, as the head of the Romish Church; but directly responsible, as an individual, because he would not, on the very same principles, be it ever understood, on which Romanists do act now, who take the oath of allegiance, *permit* these men to save their lives. But we give Archdeacon Stopford's account in his own words.

"The case of the Romish priests executed in King James's reign was this:—

"In the first years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the Reformed and the adherents of the pope lived together in peace. In 1569 Pope Pius V. issued a Bull, in which he declared the queen deposed from her throne, and called on every Roman Catholic to rebel against her. This Bull was afterwards renewed against her successor, King James I.

"The pope also instituted seminaries or colleges abroad, for educating priests who should preach this doctrine in England, and stir up the people to rebellion under the name of religion. All these priests were declared guilty of treason, and made liable to its punishment. But it was not for their religion they were punished, but for their rebellion. *This appears from the fact that after their conviction they always had this offer made to them, that, if they would acknowledge James as king, by taking the oath of allegiance, they should have a free pardon, they might keep what doctrines they pleased; no one of them was ever asked to change his religion as a condition of being pardoned. They did not die rather than change their religion; they died rather than acknowledge as king one whom the pope had deposed. It was for treason they suffered.* Sincerely do I commiserate those priests. Sincerely do I admire their courage and fidelity, even while protesting against the wickedness of their doctrines, and the folly of their conduct. For these men fondly desired to take the oath of allegiance, and earnestly did

they beseech THE POPE to *spare their lives*. But the pope mercilessly sacrificed them to his claims of temporal power in England¹."

And how does the Archdeacon prove these assertions? By a quotation from the "Columbanus" of the Rev. C. O'Connor, "a Roman Catholic, and a Roman Catholic priest, the most learned and candid historian that Ireland has yet produced." Dr. O'Connor says :

"There is yet extant a petition to Pope Paul V., signed by eleven priests, who were under sentence of death in Newgate, for refusing James's oath (of allegiance) in 1612. Two of their companions had already suffered death for this offence. They died in resistance to legitimate authority, and by the instigation of a foreign power.

"In their petitions they entreat of his holiness, *by all that is sacred*, to attend to their horrible situation, and they beg of him to point out to them *clearly* in what that oath, for which they were condemned to die, is repugnant to Catholic faith. . . . The Catholic religion, calumniated on account of the ambition of its court, had travelled barefoot over the Alps and Apennines, from the dreary cells of a dark and noxious prison, and stood bareheaded and trembling, petitioning for admission at the haughty portals of the Vatican! ay—and admission was refused! Day after day passed and no answer was received, but that which might be collected from the sullen silence of impenetrable obstinacy, and unbending domination! Both Sixtus and Pius V. had addressed their bulls (deposing Queen Elizabeth from the throne of England) with these magnificent titles:—'*We who are placed on the Supreme Throne of Justice, enjoying supreme dominion over all the Kings and Princes and States of the whole earth, not by human, but by divine authority,*' &c.; and now, how could it be expected that, in compliance with the petition of eleven beggarly priests of the second order, such magnificent titles should be resigned? No, said the scarlet cardinal, perish the idea! let not an iota be yielded, else we shall lose our worldly dominion, '*Venient Romani et tollent nostram gentem et regnum.*' All the pride, and pomp, and glory of the Vatican would then be swept away from the face of the earth, and what would then be the fate of the thunders of scarlet cardinals and purple monsignores?

"In consequence of this horrible decision, the following innocent *English* (Roman Catholic) clergymen—alas! how many Irish—suffered as victims to the domination of vicars apostolic, and the fatal influence of the court of Rome²."

Then he enumerates them, and thus continues:—

"Let us now consider who, in the eye of unprejudiced reason, was the persecutor and executioner of those unfortunate men, James or the pope? The evidence of facts is irresistible. The question bears not one moment's examination³."

¹ Letter to Dr. Marshall, pp. 23, 24.

² Pp. 49. 51.

³ P. 52.

We pray our reader's earnest attention to Archdeacon Stopford's conclusion from this history. We have only to substitute Dr. Newman for Dr. Marshall in one passage, and we might suppose him to be reviewing the Birmingham Lectures.

"It is manifest that with all this, the Church of England had nothing whatever to do. Yet Dr. Marshall says, it was by these executions of the priests that he knew the Church of England to be a false Church! that it was this which led him to change!

"Is it possible to *believe* such reasons? He knew the Church of England by this! But what did Dr. O'Connor know by it? He knew the ambition, the pride, the cold-blooded policy, the sanguinary cruelty of the pope and the court of Rome, and he had the manliness to say it. If Dr. Marshall had known that the true version of this story was so near at hand, and from such a source,—from an Irish Roman Catholic priest, renowned for his learning and his courage,—would he have ventured to produce it as he has done? What, I ask again, are such reasons worth, except to show that no better can be given for leaving the Church of England and Ireland, to join the Church of Rome '?"

So much for Dr. Newman and "Protestant" persecution.

We have to consider, in the next place, the observations which Dr. Newman has made on the subject of Romish relics, and Romish miracles; a question in itself of very great importance, and one to which we must take the liberty of calling the special attention of our readers. In the previous portion of the Birmingham Lectures, Dr. Newman has simply set at defiance alike good taste, historical testimony, and his own previous knowledge of that Church against which his bitterest attacks have been directed. In his seventh Lecture he has, we fully believe unintentionally, in his new-born zeal for the Church to which he now belongs, attacked the very foundations of Christian belief, has opened a door to the grossest scepticism, the most blasphemous infidelity. This is a heavy charge to make, and one which requires, therefore, to be very carefully substantiated; one which ought not to be made without the strongest possible proof of its correctness. That proof we shall endeavour to supply. Let us first see what is Dr. Newman's argument. He sets out with expressing his full and entire belief in the truth of well nigh every miracle, in the genuineness of well nigh every relic, of which the "Catholic" Church has, at any period in her history, claimed the credit:—

"Certainly," he says, "the Catholic Church, from east to west, from north to south, is, according to our conceptions, hung with miracles.

¹ Letter to Dr. Marshall, p. 53.

The store of relics is inexhaustible; they are multiplied through all lands, and each particle of each has in it at least a dormant, perhaps an energetic, virtue of supernatural operation. At Rome there is the True Cross, the crib of Bethlehem, and the chair of St. Peter; portions of the crown of thorns are kept at Paris: the holy coat is shown at Trèves; the winding-sheet at Turin; at Monza, the iron crown is formed out of a Nail of the cross; and another Nail is claimed for the Duomo of Milan; and pieces of our Lady's habit are to be seen in the Escorial. The Agnus Dei, blest medals, the scapular, the cord of St. Francis, all are the medium of divine manifestations and graces. Crucifixes have bowed the head to the suppliant, and Madonnas have bent their eyes upon assembled crowds. St. Januarius's blood liquefies periodically at Naples, and St. Winifred's well is the scene of wonders even in an unbelieving country⁵."

He mentions many other cases, but the above quoted will suffice as a sample. He next proceeds to give his reasons for this belief. He maintains that, inasmuch as God wrought, at the INCARNATION, the most stupendous miracle that can possibly be imagined, therefore there is no antecedent improbability in the belief that He will continue to work miracles. These are his words:—

" Catholics, then, hold the mystery of the Incarnation; and the Incarnation is the most stupendous event which ever can take place on earth; and after it and henceforth, I do not see how we can scruple at any miracle on the mere ground of its being unlikely to happen. No miracle can be so great as that which took place in the Holy House of Nazareth; it is indefinitely more difficult to believe than all the miracles of the breviary, of the Martyrology, of Saints' lives, of legends, of local traditions put together; and there is the grossest inconsistency, on the very face of the matter, for any one so to strain out the gnat and to swallow the camel, as to profess what is inconceivable, yet to protest against what is surely within the limits of intelligible hypothesis⁶."

Afterwards Dr. Newman still further declares his belief:—

" For myself," he says, " lest I appear in any way to be shrinking from a determinate judgment on the claims of some of those miracles and relics, which Protestants are so startled at, and to be hiding particular questions in what is vague and general, I will avow distinctly, that, putting out of the question the hypothesis of unknown laws of nature (which is an evasion from the force of any proof), I think it impossible to withstand the evidence which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, and for the motion of the eyes of the pictures of the Madonna in the Roman States.

⁵ Pp. 285, 286.

⁶ P. 291.

I firmly believe that the relics of the saints are doing innumerable miracles and graces daily, and that it needs only for a Catholic to show devotion to any saint in order to receive special benefits from his intercession. I firmly believe that saints in their lifetime have before now raised the dead to life, crossed the sea without vessels, multiplied grain and bread, cured incurable diseases, and stopped the operation of the laws of the universe in a multitude of ways. Many men, when they hear an educated man so speak, will at once impute the avowal to insanity, or to an idiosyncrasy, or to imbecility of mind, or to decrepitude of powers, or to fanaticism, or to hypocrisy. *They have a right to say so, if they will; and we have a right to ask them why they do not say it of those who bow down before the Mystery of mysteries, the Divine Incarnation.* If they do not believe this, they are not yet Protestants; if they do, let them grant that He, who has done the greater, may do the less⁷."

Such, then, is a brief summary of Dr. Newman's belief, and of his reasons for it.

Now, on the first appearance of these Lectures, a great sensation was caused by the particular passages we have just quoted. Many persons, and, in particular, the Bishop of Norwich, charged the writer with placing, with intending to place, the miracles of Scripture, and Romish miracles, on the same footing; with asserting, we quote the words of the Bishop, "that these legends have *a claim to belief equally* with that Word of God, which relates the miracles of our God, as recorded in the Gospel, and that *the authority of the one is as the authority of the other, the credibility of the one based on a foundation no less sure than the credibility of the other*."⁸

Dr. Newman denied that he ever intended to assert any thing of the kind. He says—

"If you describe me as saying that the ecclesiastical miracles come to us on the *same evidence* as those of Scripture, you attribute to me what I never dreamed of saying; if you understand me to say that they are on the same level of *antecedent probability* with those of Scripture, you do justice to my meaning. Ecclesiastical miracles are *probable*, because Scripture miracles are *true*. I really cannot conceive a thoughtful person denying, that the history of the ark at the deluge is as difficult to reason as a saint floating on his cloak⁹."

Such is, briefly, the purport of Dr. Newman's explanation to the Bishop of Norwich of the passages we have quoted.

Now, before commenting on this explanation, we are bound to

⁷ Pp. 297—299.

⁸ Morning Chronicle, Oct. 22, 1851.

⁹ Ibid.

say that it is, to a certain extent, satisfactory. We acquit Dr. Newman of any *intention* of placing ecclesiastical and Scriptural miracles on precisely the same footing. But we are nevertheless firmly persuaded that such is exactly the meaning which ninety-nine persons out of every hundred of those, for whom these "Lectures" were specially intended, will put upon the language he has here used; and moreover that, for such interpretation, Dr. Newman is directly responsible; as much as he, who puts a deadly weapon into the hands of a child, or an idiot, is directly responsible for the mischief which may ensue from its use. But this by the way. Let us for a moment consider Dr. Newman's explanation. We conceive, then, that there are several very substantial reasons for demurring to the assertion, that "ecclesiastical miracles are on the same level of *antecedent probability* with the miracles of Scripture." In the first place, it is matter of history, that a great number of Romish "miracles" have been *proved to be* gross frauds. In the second place, they, under whose auspices, if we may so speak, they have been set forth, have had a direct interest in maintaining the reality. It is notorious that enormous profits have accrued to the Romish Church from votive offerings, and in divers other ways. In the next place, these miracles are generally set forth under circumstances of mystery and disguise. They are not allowed to be thoroughly investigated. We do not now say that they will not bear examination; but we do say it is perfectly notorious, that such examination is never permitted, at any rate beyond a certain point. Now wherever there is mystery, there is, apart from Divine Revelation, always a natural suspicion. Take, for example, the case of the "blood of St. Januarius," of which Dr. Newman thus speaks:—

"Bring before the Protestant the largest mass of evidence and testimony in proof of the miraculous liquefaction of St. Januarius's blood at Naples, let him be urged by witnesses of the highest character, chemists of the first fame, circumstances the most favourable for the detection of imposture, coincidences and confirmations the most close, and minute, and indirect, he will not believe it; his First Principle *blocks* belief¹."

But now we submit that this is just begging the whole question. They who have the charge of this annual "miracle" will not allow of any chemical investigation. They shrink from scrutiny. They ignore all inquiry; and, so long as they do so, so long will suspicion attach to every "Protestant" mind on the subject. Let the Neapolitan church, on the next occurrence of

¹ P. 288.

this "miracle," which a Roman Catholic writer has described as a gross fraud enacted by the priests, invite English chemists to come and analyze it; let them court the minutest investigation, the closest inquiry; and then we will believe at least this, that they who superintend it, *are convinced themselves of its reality*. Meantime we will, for the especial benefit of Dr. Newman, quote a passage on this subject from Mr. Whiteside's "Italy." That able writer thus speaks of the "miracle," respecting which, according to Dr. Newman, there is as much "antecedent probability" as respecting the INCARNATION!

"The reader is perhaps aware of the nature of this performance. The skull and bones of a man dead for centuries, are brought into the church and placed opposite a phial which is said to contain some of the blood, in a congealed state, of the same dead man; and the fiction is, that the juxtaposition of the dry bones and bottle makes the blood to liquefy miraculously. . . . In reference to this ceremony, deliberately acted in the nineteenth century, in the house of God, and in a polished capital of Christian Europe, I had a curious conversation with a young nobleman connected with the court. This conversation was not sought by me, nor held under any the least confidence; it sprang out of a domestic occurrence not necessary to detail. The portion material to the purpose of disclosing truth I give. The conversation began by the Neapolitan thus:—

" 'Believe me, Signor, the Catholic religion is the best in the world.' —Answer: 'I am glad to hear you say so; sincerity in our belief is of the utmost importance. Since you introduce this topic, may I ask what is your belief as to the miracle of St. Januarius?' The Neapolitan replied without a moment's hesitation: 'I believe it to be an imposition, of course!' 'Does any man of your rank in Naples believe it?' 'Not one,' he replied. 'Permit me then to inquire, how do you justify witnessing the imposture, and appearing to sanction what you know to be false?' He coloured slightly, and then gave a reply never to be forgotten by me. 'Signor, you are a stranger, and evidently unacquainted with the state of things in this kingdom. There exists a compact between the government and the priests, each to support the other in their abuses. The priests will sustain the government so long as it sustains them; and when this imposture is acted, it is part of the bargain that the king and the court shall attend, and so must I, and every one who holds a place under the king, be present—for if the nobility and sovereign were absent, the people might suppose this proceeded from unbelief—therefore the priests insist on our presence; but you mistake in supposing this has any thing to do with the Roman Catholic religion.' "

But however this may be, and although we think our case on

² Italy, &c. vol. iii. pp. 90, 91.

this point of "antecedent probability" tolerably strong, this question, after all, is not the one we have now to discuss. What we are now concerned with is to show that, in his zeal for what we must, *pace* Dr. Newman, take the liberty of calling, the superstitious element in the Romish system, he has, unintentionally we readily believe, but not the less surely, given occasion to the grossest scepticism, the most blasphemous infidelity. These Birmingham Lectures have been published in a cheap form for more speedy circulation. Now, of those who will read the passages we have quoted, how many, does Dr. Newman suppose, will have the ability, let alone the inclination, to appreciate the fine-drawn distinction between the two senses of the term "credibility," to which he refers in his explanation? Granting that explanation to be sound, and, abstractedly, we grant its soundness to a certain extent, we are perfectly convinced that the Bishop of Norwich truly described the effect of these passages, when he said—

"What I should fear is, not, indeed, that the generality of your readers will exalt legends into Scripture, but that, *seeing grounds for discrediting the legends, they will look on all narratives of miracles, scriptural and legendary, as alike doubtful, and more than doubtful.* In short, your view, as I see it, tends to a scepticism and infidelity, of which I fully acquit you³."

But, if our statements on this point were merely hypothetical, we should be little warranted in using, towards Dr. Newman, such language as we have used. We regret to say that we can confirm the fears of the Bishop of Norwich, fully and completely. Dr. Newman has supplied a text in his Birmingham Lectures, the "WEEKLY DISPATCH" shall supply a commentary upon Dr. Newman's assertions. We need not, perhaps, tell our readers, that this infamous journal has, unhappily, an enormous circulation among that class of persons who are most deeply tainted with infidel and atheistical tendencies. By the merest chance, just while Dr. Newman's Lectures were exciting so much observation, our attention was arrested by seeing in the "Dispatch" the article which heads this paper, entitled, "Newman and the Protestant logic." So horribly blasphemous is this article, that nothing but a paramount sense of duty would justify us in introducing it into these pages. As it is, we entreat our reader's particular attention, not simply to the matter, but to the style and language of this vile production. We will tell them our reasons for so doing presently. The first half of the article is

³ Morning Chronicle, Oct. 22, 1851.

occupied with an attack upon the “blustering hypocrisy” of “Protestantism,” of which we spare our readers the infliction. Then the writer thus proceeds :—

“But the time is fast passing away when such dissensions and manœuvres can satisfy the reflecting as an answer to an argument which, worthless in itself, is perfectly irresistible in its application. The controversy has arrived at that stage at which Protestantism, no longer having conceded to it the right to assume the jaunty air of pragmatical superiority, is put upon its trial, and must make good its defence. There is a cool, dispassionate, thinking, and educated *neutral* public, always the ultimate guides and arbiters of opinion, who are no longer satisfied that the receiver of stolen goods should escape justice by calling for a halter to the thief. Newman has put the question quite fairly, and his opponents have evaded it. We shall repeat the interrogatory, and, what is more, we shall insist upon an answer, or ‘*know the reason why.*’ The doctrine of the Trinity is no mystery. Athanasius insists upon making it very plain—the Church adopts his creed *verbatim*. It is perspicuously, minutely, with the particularity of an inventory, and the business-like detail of an auctioneer, described with the definiteness of a saint, who was not overawed by his subject from preserving the literal finicality of the dogmatist. As he states it, the doctrine involves a moral and physical impossibility—is a palpable and flat self-contradiction—defies the very elements of vulgar arithmetic, and is abhorrent to every dictate of common sense, and every known law of human reason. Now what we and Dr. Newman want to know is, what right or object can any man have who *says* at least that he believes in this doctrine, to call *any* other believer in any thing superstitious or credulous? What apology has the disciple of consubstantiation for sneering at transubstantiation? Why should a devout believer in the loquacity of Balaam’s ass, or Ezekiel’s vision of cow’s dung, boggle about ‘blinking statues or bleeding pictures?’ Why should he who piously swallows both Jonah and the whale, strain his spiritual gullet at the temptations of Saint Anthony? Or why should he whose conceptions of the godhead are so humble as to accept the description in Genesis of the Almighty ‘*walking in the garden in the cool of the day (!!!)*,’ or that other in the Evangel of his being a baby and circumcised—of his having cousins, brothers, and a mother, who went after him, called him out of the synagogue, and said ‘Thy FATHER and I have sought thee sorrowing’—why should such a believer be so shocked at those who worship ‘the Mother of God,’ and crown her ‘Queen of Heaven?’ Is the Romish parallel between Eve and Mary any less credible than that a serpent should speak, and we should all be damned because ‘the general mother of mankind’ longed for a pippin? That miracles ceased with the apostolic age is a purely gratuitous Protestant assumption, not only without the warrant, but opposed to the implied language of Scripture. The fact is—they either *never* existed, or they have never ceased; at least for all the evidence

or probabilities producible to the contrary. To come nearer to the case of churchmen, what right or reason has the man who believes that the sprinkling water on an infant's face by one priest will wash away original sin, and regenerate it by mere force of his office, and the same act by another will have no such saving efficacy, to ignore the infallibility of the Pope, and the authority of his priesthood in spirituals? 'In endeavouring,' well observes Foxton, 'to wriggle himself out of this painful dilemma, the contortions of the Protestants' advocate are absolutely ludicrous. At one moment he talks as liberally as a French *savant*, and the next buries himself in a cloud of the vaguest mysticism. He is alternately a saint and a philosopher—a Methodist and an 'Infidel,' and hashes together the rationalism of Strauss and the maundering of John Bunyan. If Popery be a 'lie,' surely this sort of Protestantism is a sham; and the time cannot be far distant when men will discover that their belief must repose either on their internal convictions or on external authority, and that it matters little whether the Pope is enthroned at Lambeth or in Rome⁴."

Now we might say much here on the expression "*we and Dr. Newman.*" We might quote the old proverb, *noscitur a sociis*. In sober sadness we forbear. But we do solemnly put it to Dr. Newman, as a Christian man—we put it to him as an ordained priest of the Catholic Church—we put it to him as a believer in the mysteries of Divine revelation—as a firm believer in that stupendous miracle "which took place in the holy house of Nazareth"—we put it to him, whether the victory he sought to gain is equal in value to the price he has paid for it? We care not a straw, whether his theory of "antecedent probability" be sound or unsound; but we ask him whether he is content to establish that theory at the cost of such a gloss, as the writer we have just quoted has put upon it. We ask him whether it would not have been better, for the interests of our common Christianity, that every alleged "ecclesiastical miracle," since the days of Constantine, should have been proved to be an imposition, than that *he* should have been the occasion of such a mass of blasphemy being disseminated among that "cool, dispassionate, thinking, and educated *neutral* public," who are the principal readers of the "Weekly Dispatch:" and then, moreover, we put it to our readers, whether the "fair form of Catholicism" has cause to exult, or to mourn, at the attempt of Dr. Newman to improve her "present position" among the "Protestants" of England, by the delivery and the publication of his Birmingham Lectures.

But we have not yet done with this article. It is our deliberate conviction—a conviction which we allow we cannot establish

⁴ This is reprinted exactly as it appeared in the "Dispatch."

by *actual proof*—but which yet is firmly established in our own mind, *that this article was written by a Romanist, or at least by a party in the pay of the Romish Church.* Many of our readers will, not unnaturally, start with indignant astonishment at such an assertion. We entreat their patient attention to our argument in support of that conviction. Mark, first of all, the very singular phraseology of the article in question. Look how the writer brings in “Transubstantiation,” “blinking statues or bleeding pictures,” “the temptations of St. Anthony,” “the Mother of God,” the crowning the Virgin “Queen of Heaven,” “the Romish parallel between Eve and Mary,” “the infallibility of the Pope,” “the authority of his priesthood in spirituals.” Then let them consider the assertion of the writer with respect to miracles—then the very singular expression “the Evangel.” Is all this what we should naturally expect in a writer, who was simply endeavouring to destroy the credit of “Protestantism,” without any wish to build up some other belief in its room? We venture to think not. Surely a pure infidel would have railed at Popery and Protestantism alike; would have sought to destroy the credit of both *pari passu*; would have denounced both as impostures, and Popery as the most gigantic and flagrant imposture of the two. But not so here. Mark, rather, how carefully the writer eschews *any direct condemnation of Romanism*, how precisely his argument is identical with that *originally attributed to Dr. Newman*, only clothed in language more suitable to the capacity and the taste of his readers. Is it not, in fact, just the language one would use, who would rather his readers should be Infidels than “Protestants,” but rather they should be Romanists than either? Now then take this into account. At the time of the “Papal Aggression,” a report was extensively circulated that the Romanists had “bought the ‘Dispatch.’” Certain it is, that in an article in the “Dublin Review” for January, 1851, stated in the Court of Chancery to have been written by Cardinal Wiseman, the “Weekly Dispatch” is held up to the “Catholic” world in terms of very suspicious commendation. We will quote the words of the article.

“The weekly press has been more just, with some exceptions. We regret, indeed, that the able articles in the *Weekly Dispatch* should have been sullied with irreligious language, which made it impossible to recommend the perusal; but often this blot has been withheld, and then, indeed, we have been gratified by the bold, uncompromising, and truly masculine eloquence with which the charlatanism of Cumming, and the ‘atrocities’ of M’Neile have been lashed, and the hypocrisy of canting illiberality unmasked.”

There is such a thing as "damning with faint praise," and there is such a thing as praising with faint censure. Can we conceive a Christian bishop praising, under any circumstances, the *Weekly Dispatch*, except for a purpose? Now let our readers put all these things together. Then let them take in the historical fact, that, in the reign of Elizabeth, Romish priests were detected in playing at "Puritanism," for the sake of the reaction on wavering minds. Let them consider the "Gawthorne" correspondence; and then let them say whether there is an "antecedent improbability" to the hypothesis we have ventured to submit to them. It is, and it must be but an hypothesis; but it is one respecting which the evidence, both internal and external, so to speak, is in our opinion singularly strong. That hypothesis is, that a Romish writer, or one in the pay of Rome, has deliberately and wilfully ranged himself on the side of the deadliest enemies of the *Christian faith*, for the sake of injuring "Protestantism."

Any how, we ask whether our assertion is not now proved to the letter, that Dr. Newman, by his rash, unguarded, intemperate statements respecting Romish and Scriptural miracles, has opened a door to the "grossest scepticism, the most blasphemous infidelity"—a door which he will find it extremely difficult ever again to shut.

And here we take our leave of Dr. Newman's Lectures. We have spoken of them, and of their author personally, in terms utterly abhorrent to our own feelings, and very different to those we usually employ. We leave it to the judgment of our readers to decide whether the occasion has not justified us in so doing.

And now, then, we apply ourselves to the second part of our inquiry. It will be our object to show Dr. Newman some grounds for that deeply-rooted suspicion of Romanism which, beyond all doubt, does prevail among the immense majority of the population of this country. We shall endeavour to show that this suspicion is not the result of "ignorance," or "prejudice," or "lying," or "misrepresentation;" but is, apart from all other considerations, fully justified by recent events.

The first of these events, to which we shall refer, is the late attack upon the English Church, commonly known as the "Papal Aggression." Our readers need not be alarmed. We are not going into this hackneyed subject on ecclesiastical grounds. We simply refer to it as a *deliberate breach of good faith* on the part of the Church of Rome towards the English nation, which will stand, in the judgment of posterity side by side, in moral turpitude, with the "Massacre of St. Bartholomew," or the "Revocation of the edict of Nantes." Just consider the circumstances of this transaction. A large body of our fellow-subjects were exposed, whether rightly

or wrongly matters not to our present purpose, to certain civil disabilities. These disabilities, for a long period of years, they endeavoured to remove. At last they succeeded in so doing. But mark under what circumstances. The people of England took, *as they supposed*, the most ample precautions for the supremacy of that Church, which in their hearts they so dearly love. They carefully guarded against any open attempt at rivalry between the spiritual rulers of the two Churches; against any encroachments on the Church of England, by that clause in the "Emancipation Act," which prohibited the assumption, on the part of Romish Bishops, of any titles taken from places which were at that time giving a title to English bishoprics. The purpose of that clause was manifest. It was intended plainly to prevent, at any time, Romish bishops taking "territorial titles" from *any* places in England and Ireland. Now, as a matter of fact, the Romanists accepted that clause *in its entirety*. They said, "Relieve us from our civil disabilities, and we are perfectly content. We meditate no encroachments on the English Church. All we ask is full liberty to worship God in our own way, and to be placed on a footing, as to civil rights, with our Protestant fellow-subjects." They did not say *then*, that they could not carry out their religious system without bishops taking their titles from English towns. They did not say *then*, that such titles were essential to the "full and free exercise" of their religion. They did not say *then*, that the restrictive clause in the "Emancipation Act" only referred to the existing English bishoprics. They did not say *then*, that their bishops would be at full liberty to assume titles from any places in England and Ireland except those which *at that time* gave a title to bishops of the Anglican Church. They did not say *then*, that their religion would be crippled, and maimed, and mutilated under "vicars apostolic," deriving their titles from places *in partibus infidelium*. They did not say so *then*, *because they did not think so*; and, moreover, they knew perfectly well that, if they had said so, the Act of 1829 would never, spite of the threats of civil war, about which they bluster so much *now*, spite of our "fears" for our own safety, have passed into a law.

We say then, first, that the recent assumption of "territorial titles"—the recent partition of England into Romish "dioceses"—apart from all questions bearing on the Church of England, or the "Supremacy of the Crown"—is an act of cool, deliberate treachery and bad faith on the part, not of English Romanists, but of the Church of Rome, which has never been excelled in the annals of even Romish history, which will remain as an indelible blot upon the "fair fame of Catholicism," which will never be

obliterated from the memory of the English people. We say, secondly, that the glaring fallacies, the palpable sophistry, the *ex post facto* arguments, by which Cardinal Wiseman, Mr. Bowyer, and other writers, endeavoured to justify that aggression, have taught Englishmen a lesson which they will be very long indeed in unlearning—have taught them that honour, and justice, and integrity, and open promises, and implied engagements, are at once thrown to the winds by the Church of Rome and—not by all, but by too many of her adherents—if her temporal or spiritual interests, as they imagine, can be one single atom advanced.

But take, in the next place, the case, as to which, when it occurred, all England rang with disgust and indignation—the case of Lord Feilding. We are not alluding now to Lord Feilding's perversion, though, as they who attended the Gorham meeting at St. Martin's Hall, know perfectly well, we might say much as to *mala fides* on that point. But we refer simply to the case of the church at Pantasa. Lord and Lady Feilding, while members of the English Communion, determined to build a church at Pantasa. The foundation stone of that church was laid with every possible circumstance of solemnity, in the presence of the Bishop of St. Asaph—the Holy Eucharist being celebrated on the occasion. But, during the process of building the church, Lord and Lady Feilding changed their religion—and what then? Not simply do they stop the works, as they had an undoubted right to do; not simply do they refuse, as they had an equal right to do, to contribute *any further* towards the completion of that church, but they actually took with them, so to speak, to the Church of Rome, the part of the church already built, which, in the sight of God and man, on every principle of common justice, *in foro conscientiæ*, as much belonged to the Church of England as Lord Feilding's own property belonged to him! And yet, forsooth, Dr. Newman has the effrontery to talk about "Protestant prejudice" against the Romish religion, being based simply upon "lying," and misrepresentation, and fraud!

And, take again the glaring case of Miss Talbot. Out of respect to the distinguished position that lady holds, we will say very little on this subject. We simply say this, Is there a single man, woman, or child, in the British empire, who believes that, but for Mr. Grantley Berkeley, that lady would now be occupying that position? Is there a single person credulous enough to believe that that lady's 80,000*l.* would ever have eluded the grasp of the Church of Rome, but for the interposition of the Lord Chancellor? If there be one such person, he must be, indeed, the very phoenix of simple-mindedness! If there be one such person, we beg him to read the following pages.

While preparing the materials for this paper, we determined to wade through the mass of evidence taken by the Parliamentary Committee on the law of mortmain, thinking it possible we might find something therein bearing on our present subject. We found then, for one thing, a full account of the case which attracted so much of public attention at the time it was pending in the Vice-Chancellor's court, the case of "*Metairie versus Wiseman*." We say confidently that, in the annals of a court of justice, no case was ever brought forward, disclosing a grosser moral fraud upon the relations of a dying man, and one which gave foundation for a heavier charge of moral turpitude against the system of the Church of Rome, and the particular parties under whom, in this instance, that system was practically carried out. We shall wait with no little anxiety for the report of that Committee, which has been, we are happy to say, reappointed this session. Meantime our readers shall judge of this case for themselves.

Mathurin Carré was a French emigrant, residing at Somers Town. He lived in a wretched garret, with the reputation of extreme poverty; supporting himself partly by teaching, and partly by an allowance from an emigrant fund. The old man fell ill, and a medical man, a Frenchman and a Roman Catholic, was called in to see him. This took place on the 28th of February, 1847. So extreme was Carré's apparent poverty that the medical man, when he first saw him, said that he ought to have port wine, arrowroot, &c., but that it was of no use ordering them, as "the poor creature" could not pay for them. Hamilton, however, the landlord of Carré, stated that he was really a very rich man, having a sum of 10,000*l.* in the funds. Upon this the medical man forthwith posts off to Mr. Holdstock, the Romish priest of the district. Mr. Holdstock, as far as it appears, was before perfectly unknown to Carré personally. Mr. John Athanasius Cooke, a Romish pervert and a barrister, the legal factotum in this whole transaction, distinctly states, "I did not know, at the time, whether Mr. Holdstock did or did not know M. Carré⁶." Well, Mr. Holdstock promptly attends the summons. Upon the Sunday afternoon he sends off for the aforesaid J. A. Cooke, and gives him instructions for a will, which instructions were never produced before the Vice-Chancellor. *They were lost.* Mr. J. A. Cooke, at once, proceeds himself, *without calling in an attorney*, a most unusual course, as he allows, to prepare a will, in which *he was appointed an executor*, and by which 7000*l.* in the 3¼ per cent. bank annuities were left to Bishop Griffiths and the said

⁶ Blue Book, p. 203.

J. A. Cooke, in trust for the Girls' School attached to the "Catholic" chapel of St. Aloysius, Clarendon Square; while 3000*l.* in the *three per cent. consols*, mark the difference of stock, were left among Carré's *two brothers, his sister, and a deceased sister's children*. On Monday, the 1st of March, Holdstock and Cooke go together to Carré's house with the will. The old man was in a sinking state. That will Carré refused to sign, and then Cooke suggested that a deed, with a power of attorney to transfer the stock, would be preferable to a will, *as it would save the charity 700*l.* legacy duty*. While Holdstock and Cooke were there, two women *happened* to come in, one the housekeeper, the other an intimate friend of Holdstock. They were sent back again, their services as witnesses to the will not being then required. Meantime Cooke prepares a deed of gift and a power of attorney for the transfer of the stock. The deed provided for the 7000*l.* going to the "Catholic School," Cooke himself, Bishop Griffiths, and Carré, being trustees under the deed. On the following Thursday evening the same persons go to Carré's house, with the deed of gift, the power of attorney, and another will, mark this, by which the 3000*l.* stock was left to Carré's relations, *in which will there is not the slightest mention of the aforesaid deed, or of the 7000*l.** The parties go in. Carré refuses to do any business. The priest leans over and speaks to him *in French*. So unwilling was Carré, by the evidence of the defendant's own attesting witness, Miss Clark, to have any thing to do with the matter, that Cooke actually folded up the papers and proposed leaving the room, but was prevented by the interposition of some other party, though *she* does not mention Holdstock's name. After this, the priest himself supports the old man, puts a pen into his hand, and thereupon the three documents are duly executed. Carré then ordered Cooke to leave the documents, but *he refused to leave the deed and power of attorney*, but took them with him, and left the will, having first distinctly assured the "dying" man that he could, *whenever he pleased*, revoke the deed. The parties then left the house. *On the Friday morning* Cooke posts off to the Bank with the power of attorney. He lodges this there, and effects the transfer at half-past one the next day, just in time to save the old man's death. Carré died on Saturday afternoon. Cooke, in his evidence before the Committee, states that on the Saturday evening he went to Golden Square, to the house of Dr. Griffiths, the Vicar-Apostolic, and told him of the circumstances. Now mark, Cooke states, in answer to a question by Mr. Keogh, that Dr. Griffiths *knew nothing whatever of this transaction till after Carré's death*. He afterwards requests to "correct" this evidence. We have seen in our time a good many criminal trials. We have

carefully read the whole of the evidence of Mr. John Athanasius Cooke, "corrections" and all, and we declare solemnly, that we never, at the Old Bailey, or any where else, saw any witness wriggle, and twist, and shuffle, and evade, worse than Cooke appears to have done under the cross-examination of Mr. Anstey. He says at last, "*I think that, as Dr. Griffiths did not express surprise, he must have known of the gift by some means.*" There was an interval between the Thursday and the Saturday, during which Dr. Griffiths *MIGHT have heard of the transaction!*" We should state that an interval of a fortnight elapsed between Mr. Cooke's two examinations.

Such is a brief outline of this most remarkable, may we not fairly say, of this most infamous and iniquitous transaction. Let us just consider it with reference to the conduct, first of Carré, the testator; secondly, of the legal factotum, John Athanasius Cooke; and, thirdly, of the priest Holdstock.

We are asked then to believe that this old miser—he was seventy-seven years of age—who was so particular as to his dividends, that even his own broker refused, on the day before he died, to allow Hamilton, his landlord, to take a quarter's dividend by a power of attorney, without a personal interview with Carré himself; that this old man, deliberately, knowingly, and wittingly, without any moral "duress," any "undue influence," executed a deed, by which 7000*l.* was *conveyed away from him to trustees*, for the benefit of a Girls' "Catholic" School; and, moreover, signed at the same time, a power of attorney, under which the property might be, and under which it actually was, transferred from his own possession to the trustees, within two days, *and before his own death.* We submit to our readers that the most imaginative writer of fiction—even Dr. Newman, writing about the Church of England—never invented any thing, in the nature of things, so absurdly improbable! From a careful consideration of all the material parts of the evidence, we have not the slightest moral doubt that Carré, in signing the power of attorney, believed that he was simply signing a document, empowering parties to receive the dividends then due on the stock. We do not say that the parties intended him to think so. But we have no doubt whatever in our own minds as to Carré's own opinion on this particular point.

But now consider the conduct of Mr. John Athanasius Cooke. This gentleman, in defiance of all professional usage, "descended," we use the graphic language of Mr. Bethell, "almost to menial offices in the preparation of the deed—receiving instructions for it, preparing it, seeing to its endorsement, paying for the stamp of it, and uniting in his own single person all the different professional services that are rendered by counsel, by solicitors, and

by law-stationers'." This, to say the least of it, is somewhat singular !

And consider his conduct with regard to the will, not, observe, the original will, which Carré would not execute, but the will by which the 3000*l.* were given to Carré's relations. In that will *there is not the smallest reference of any sort or kind to the "Deed" by which, on the very same day, Carré had assigned away the larger amount of stock, the 7000*l.** By the terms of that will—our readers may safely take our word, for we have carefully read it,—by the terms of that will, no one of Carré's relations would have the smallest suspicion that the testator had ever been possessed of a single farthing more than the 3000*l.* Nay, more than this ; Cooke himself distinctly states to the Parliamentary Committee what follows. He wrote as executor to the relations of Carré respecting the bequest of 3000*l.* He is asked, upon this, "In giving the particulars of the property, did you make any allusion to the 7000*l.*?" The answer is, "*None whatever ; I considered it my duty as trustee to withhold it ; I considered that the deed was not obtained from M. Carré by any undue pressure, that it was his free disposition ; I considered that the family had no legal right under that deed, and that I was consequently justified in not informing them of the disposition made by that deed '.*" Did our readers ever see a reply to a question which so forcibly suggested the proverb, *qui s'excuse, s'accuse*? Comment on it would be wholly superfluous.

One word more on this point. We were somewhat staggered on reading over the Blue Book, to find that, although Cooke had plainly enough declared all this, yet he states that Dr. Griffiths had paid over to the relations a cheque for the "proportionate part of the dividends which had accrued (*on the whole of the 10,000*l.* stock*) up to March '."

We said to ourselves, as we dare say our readers will say too, that this fact was scarcely consistent with the seeming desire to conceal from the relations all knowledge of the 7000*l.* Now mark, we do not like to use hard words, so we will simply say, the *cunning* manner, in which this was done. They were obliged by law to render an account up to March *on the whole of the stock*. That account now lies before us, and we will tell our readers how they did it. One item of that account is 92*l.*, in respect of the proportionate part of the dividends on the whole stock—but they took very good care not so to describe it—that would have disclosed the whole affair. They entered this 92*l.* *as a debt due to the testator from Dr. Griffiths!* Mark, they do not say one word as to

⁷ Speech of Mr. Bethell in "*Metairie v. Wiseman.*"

⁸ Blue Book, pp. 240 241.

⁹ P. 324.

who Dr. Griffiths was ; but they leave the relatives to suppose, if they pleased, that he was somebody or other to whom, at some time or other, Carré had *lent* 92*l.*, and now he had repaid it. It is thus stated in the "Executorship account :"—"*April 14, By cash from Dr. Griffiths for money due to the deceased at the time of his death, 92*l.* 7*s.**" And yet the "Tablet," that most veracious Romish organ, endeavoured in an article of six columns, now before us, to whitewash this most wretched transaction. "Any how," says the writer, "*if there was* INDISCRETION, *there was no* DISHONESTY !"

But we have to consider, lastly, the conduct of Mr. Holdstock, Carré's "spiritual director ;" and he is, in reference to our subject, the most important personage, because, by virtue of Cardinal Wiseman's eulogy upon him, which we shall quote presently, he represents the system of the Romish Church. Mr. Holdstock hears, after morning mass, of the illness of Carré, *and of his property*, from Gasquet, the medical man. He loses no time in visiting him. He takes instructions for the will, *which instructions are lost*. He sends for his legal factotum, Mr. J. A. Cooke, *on the Sunday evening*. He goes with him *the next morning*, having his witnesses to the wished-for will all ready to follow him. They do follow him, but to no purpose. Now mark, although Cooke distinctly asserts that Holdstock represented Carré to him as "*a dying man*," Holdstock does not go near him more than once, though he lived close to him, till Thursday afternoon. Then he goes with a train of attendants, all ready for the execution of the will. He there and then, as their own witnesses allow, *by his personal influence*, "persuaded" the unwilling Carré to sign the documents. He goes away, *and he never once goes near that wretched old man again !* Now, let our readers consider the value which Romanists profess, we mean no sneer by the term, to attribute to the "last rites" of their Church ; and then let them consider further, that this wretched old man, who appears, up to Sunday, never to have had one solitary thought about religion—even then it was by no act of his own that the priest came to him—that this wretched old man was

"Cut off even in the blossoms of his sins,
Unhousel'd, disappointed, unanel'd ;
No reckoning made, but sent to his account
With all his imperfections on his head."

How does Holdstock justify himself here ? He says in his affidavit that Carré died sooner than he expected. Sooner than he expected ! Why, the man was described by himself as "*a dying man*" on Sunday, and yet he lived six whole days ! Now

the "Tablet" has the audacity thus to speak of Mr. Holdstock's conduct:—"Carré said it was true, he wished to postpone the appointment; *he felt ill and weak.*" This was on the Thursday. "*The priest exhorted him, and rightly, to get his temporal affairs fairly off his mind. Delays were dangerous.*" Dangerous to what? To the soul of the dying man, or to the Girls' "Catholic" School? And then the "Tablet" proceeds, "Surely an Anglican minister must have felt that in such a case the same exhortation was called for." Doubtless, every Anglican priest would have so thought; but we beg to tell the "Tablet," that if any Anglican priest had thought only of "delays" being "dangerous" in temporal matters, and not equally so, and much more so, *in such a case*, in things spiritual, that priest would have been most deservedly suspended, at least, by his bishop, and held up to universal execration, throughout the whole length and breadth of "Protestant" England. The "Tablet" describes Mr. Holdstock as "known for twenty-five years to all the Catholics in London, as one of the most self-denying and retiring priests in the district, who has nothing to gain from those schools of St. Aloysius, and who has nothing whatever to do with the management of them." It may be so. We do not, for a moment, insinuate that Mr. Holdstock had any personal pecuniary interest in this transaction; but we say, confidently, that there is plain, positive, undeniable proof, that, in this instance, the interests of this wretched "dying" miser's soul were not considered, by Mr. Holdstock, of *equal* importance with the interests of the Romish religion, with the welfare of the "Catholic" Girls' School of St. Aloysius, Clarendon Square. We can fully believe that Mr. Holdstock, and we speak in perfect sincerity, acted, as he believed, *ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. We believe that he acted on the principles of the Church to which he belongs. But we none the less condemn his acts; and we say that the Romish Church in England, by not disavowing those acts, must justly fall under a similar measure of most merited condemnation.

But more than this, Cardinal Wiseman has distinctly, not simply not disavowed, but has actually attached his episcopal *imprimatur* to the conduct of all the parties in this transaction. On Sunday, the 18th May of last year, Cardinal Wiseman preached a sermon for the Girls' School of St. Aloysius, and, in that sermon, he thus alludes to the case we have been considering:—

"I deliberately say, that a more unjust or unjustifiable imputation of motives or actions to those whose names have of late been before the public, it were impossible to conceive. I do not wish to dwell longer on this matter, but I cannot dismiss it without solemnly and emphatically stating, that nothing which has occurred, nothing which I have

heard, has for one moment lessened in my esteem and affection those who have been subjected to the calumnies that have been heaped upon them¹."

Now, of course, we have nothing whatever to do with the bestowal of Cardinal Wiseman's "esteem and affection;" he is perfectly welcome to bestow them wherever he pleases. We only desire to record the fact, that the head of the Anglo-Roman Church distinctly avows his deliberate opinion, that he considers it perfectly justifiable for a Romish priest, and a Romish barrister, to prepare a deed for a "dying man," without the intervention of any attorney, any one to protect that man's relations—to "persuade" that unwilling old man to sign that deed, by which two-thirds of his whole property are left to a "Catholic" School—to transfer that property within forty-eight hours after that signature—and then, to render an account to the man's relations, in which there is not the slightest mention of any transaction of the kind! We think our readers will agree with us in the opinion, that such a statement is, of itself, quite a sufficient condemnation of the principles, not of Roman Catholics, but of the system of the Romish Church.

We need only refer, very briefly, to the issue of this case. By some means or other the relations of the old man discovered the execution of the deed and the transfer of the stock. They brought an action in the Vice-Chancellor's court, which was eventually compromised by the payment to them of 4000*l.* out of the 7000*l.* which had been left to the "Catholic" School.

But we have not yet done with the "Blue Book." We cannot certainly say, "though bad begins yet worse remains behind," for we can produce nothing so bad, in detail, as the case of *Metairie v. Wiseman*, though, in principle, the case of Mr. James Molyneux Taylor is equally atrocious.

Mr. Taylor, the father of this gentleman, was an old man, a Roman Catholic, of very large property, living at Weybridge. He had two sons and three daughters. Three or four years before his death he made a will, by which the whole of his estate was, naturally, left to his children. With these children he had always lived on terms of the greatest possible love and affection. About three months before his death, his son—we are condensing his own narrative—was informed by his father, then in a very declining state of health, and "from his long illness exceedingly changed," that he intended to leave nearly all his property to his children, *for their lives*, but, in reversion, to the Anglo-Roman Church. They were not to have the slightest testamentary power over it, but simply to enjoy it for their lives. Mr. J. M. Taylor remon-

¹ Tablet, May 24.

strated, as strongly as his father's state of health would allow, but to no purpose. The will was made, and the will now stands. Somehow or other, a report was spread abroad, that Mr. Taylor had "disinherited" his children for the sake of the Romish Church, and much scandal was excited on the subject against Cardinal Wiseman personally. Now, mark, the Cardinal writes to the papers a very indignant letter, in which he first denies that he personally had any thing to do with the matter. This was perfectly true. He had nothing to do with it. But then he goes on to deny the fact of Mr. Taylor's "disinheritance." He describes all the family as in the full enjoyment of the property of their late father, and, therefore, certainly not "disinherited." Upon this Mr. J. M. Taylor wrote a most touching and beautiful letter, which we would gladly insert entire, to the "Morning Herald." In this letter he exonerates the Cardinal from any share in the transaction, and, then, he thus proceeds:—

"With respect to what Cardinal Wiseman in his letter terms my 'supposed disinheritance,' I must add, that the bulk of my father's property is left to his children for their lives only. The will contains no power enabling me to make any provision whatever in favour of a wife or children as to the property so devised; but, on the contrary, my life estate is coupled with very stringent provisions against any attempt at incumbrance or alienation."

Out of respect to his father's memory, and from a regard to the feelings of his sisters, Mr. Taylor chivalrously declined to contest this will, and so the matter now stands.

Now we have three observations to make on this case. First, that no respectable solicitor, no man of common feeling and ordinary principle, could possibly have consented to share in the making of such a will as this, considering the state of health, and the evidently morbid condition of the testator, when it was made.

Secondly, that it is to the everlasting infamy of the Romish Church, that she should have consented to accept of any provision whatever from a will made under such circumstances. Mr. Taylor was asked whether he considered that this iniquitous will was his father's own spontaneous act, or made at the suggestion of any other person. His answer is very significant, "It is impossible to say." But, in our judgment, this is perfectly immaterial. Granting that no priestly, or other influence, was used, we say, confidently, that the "spiritual director" of Mr. Taylor ought to have prevented such a will, if he had the power of doing so; and, any how, that the Church of Rome ought, in no way whatever, to have accepted its provisions. They ought to have said to Mr. Taylor, "This will is very plainly an unjust will, made by a person evidently in a morbid condition. We will have nothing

whatever to do with it. Contest the will by a friendly suit. We will not oppose you ; and if you can get it set aside, take your property, and do what you like with it." We say that Mr. Holdstock, in the former case, was bound, on every principle of common morality, not simply to have had nothing whatever to do with *assisting* Carré's execution of the deed, but to have used all his influence to *prevent* him from making it. We say that a similar principle will apply to the case of Mr. Taylor.

Thirdly, we contend that Cardinal Wiseman was guilty of a most gross and dishonest evasion, of most atrocious dissimulation, in talking about Mr. Taylor's "supposed disinheritance," about his being in the full enjoyment of his property, when he must have known, perfectly well, under what provisions that property was held.

One more case from the Blue Book, and we have done. In the years 1828 and 1829, two daughters of Mr. Alexander M'Carthy, of Cork, entered the convent of Black Rock, in the county of Cork, as "professed nuns." We condense the evidence of their brother before the Parliamentary Committee. At the time of their profession, their father paid 1000*l.* as entrance money with each of them, *on the distinct understanding that they were not to participate in any property he might leave at his death.* More than this, he actually drew up the draft of a will, in which, in consideration of this payment, he leaves his daughters, the professed nuns, a shilling each. That will was never executed, and M'Carthy died intestate, in July 1843, leaving property to the amount of 100,000*l.* Of course the other children prepared to divide this property between them. Now mark the odious, the disgusting treachery of the Romish Church. The authorities of the convent, in December 1843, and in March 1844, compelled these unhappy young women, "after considerable objection and remonstrance on their parts, and under the pressure and compulsion of their vow of obedience," to execute deeds of assignment of all their property to the convent. They then commenced proceedings in the Irish Court of Chancery, to recover the nuns' share of the 100,000*l.* The Lord Chancellor Brady delivered a very strong judgment against the claim, on this plain ground, that the nuns, in executing the deed of assignment, were under duress and undue influence. The convent appealed to the House of Lords. The Lords dismissed the appeal upon "a point of pleading," but with a very strong expression of agreement with the Lord Chancellor of Ireland, as to the question of duress and undue influence. Bishop Murphy and Father Mathew, the appellants' own witnesses, abundantly proved those points, in the opinion of Lord Cottenham. One answer of Mr. M'Carthy, the brother, we must give at length. He says :—

"Fathew Mathew states in his evidence, that he did not make use of any coercion, *save and except explaining to them the nature of their vows*. He explained to them the vow of obedience, and *that my sister would be excommunicated and deprived of the sacrament, if she did not execute the deed in compliance with her vows*."

We abstain from all comment on this case. We simply ask any man of common sense whether, taken in conjunction with the other two, it does not abundantly prove, that the principle which actuates—not, again, Roman Catholics, but the Church of Rome—is the old principle—

"rem,
Si possis, recède ; si non, quocunque modo, rem."

We ask whether reason, equity, and justice, do not imperatively require that, by some adequate alteration of the laws of mortmain, such abominable transactions as those to which we have referred, should be, as far as possible, prevented for the future.

And now, before we conclude this long paper, we desire to make one brief remark. If any think that we have derived pleasure from exposing the atrocious conduct to which we have just referred—that we have deliberately "gloated over" the errors, and failings, and infirmities of the actors in these transactions, simply from a feeling of delight at their position, simply from a wish to raise a feeling of indignation against our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen—if any think that we cannot respect honour, and justice, and integrity *in individuals*, whensoever, and wheresoever, those qualities are to be found—we can, merely, in all sincerity, deny the charge. Just consider the circumstances. Dr. Newman has challenged the production of "facts." He has ventured to tell his "brethren of the Oratory" that, "if you would have direct downright proof that Catholicism is what Protestants make it to be, *you must lie*; else you will not get beyond *feeble suspicions* which may be right and which may be wrong. The substance, the force, the edge of their tradition is *slander*." He says that, "to Protestantism false witness is *the principle of propagation*." We have simply answered Dr. Newman's challenge, and we leave him to digest the "facts" we have brought forward.

But, perhaps, as Dr. Newman is fond of a *tu quoque*, he may fancy one here also. Well, then, we, in our turn, offer him a challenge. Here, in the full light of day, in the face of the people of England, in the name, and in the behalf of, the English Church, of English "Protestantism," if Dr. Newman pleases, we challenge this slanderous vituperator of our beloved spiritual mother, to produce any acts of her children, *to which she has*

affixed her imprimatur, of which she, as a Church, has expressed her approbation, analogous, in any wise, in moral turpitude, dissimulation, and fraud, to the acts on which we have commented. We say to him, that if he can show us one Anglican layman deliberately acting as, with the full approbation of his spiritual superiors, Lord Feilding acted, in the case of the church at Pantasa, *and the Church of England glorying in the act*—if he can show us one case, in which, for the sake of her property, the Church of England deliberately prevented a young lady from taking her natural position in society, as Dr. Hendren, and the other emissaries of the “fair form of Catholicism” palpably endeavoured, and did their best, to prevent Miss Talbot—if he can point out one single, solitary, isolated case, of an Anglican priest and an Anglican barrister, conniving together to “persuade” a “dying” man to sign away the larger portion of his property from his relations, for the use and benefit of the English Church, and then the lawyer concealing that fact studiously from those relations—can show us, moreover, that the Church of England, *by one, or both, of her Archbishops*, sanctioned every part and particle of the foul transaction—if he can show us one case, in which the English Church accepted and acted upon such a grossly unjust will as that of Mr. Taylor—if he can point out one solitary act of deliberate treachery, duress, and compulsion, analogous to that of the superiors of the Black Rock convent—if he can point out one fact, in the whole of her annals, by which the Church of England stands convicted of not censuring, and therefore of conniving at, such conduct as that of Mr. Gawthorn—then, and not till then, will we allow, that the errors and the crimes committed under the Romish system, are to be ascribed, not to the influence of that system, but to fallible human nature; then will we grant that “Protestants” have no right to throw stones at the Romish religion. If he will confute the facts we have brought forward, then will we readily acknowledge that “Protestant prejudice” is based upon evidence as groundless and as unsubstantial as that which he has brought against the Church of England in his Birmingham Lectures. Meantime, we laugh to scorn the puny efforts of Dr. Newman, and ten thousand such as he, to damage the cause of the English Church. She lives, and she will continue to live, strong in her principles and her practice; strong in her scriptural doctrine and her primitive order; but stronger still in the undying love, in the unchanging affection, of that ENGLISH PEOPLE, to whom, since the Reformation, she has stood forth, and to whom she will continue to stand forth, as the strongest bulwark against Romish error, as the staunchest preservative of Catholic truth.

ART. IV.—1. *Faust. A Tragedy. Part the Second, rendered from the German of Goethe.* By ARCHER GURNEY. London: Senior.

2. *Love's Legends. Poems.* By ARCHER GURNEY. London: Mitchell.

3. *The British Churchman.*

4. *King Charles the First. A Dramatic Poem.* By the Rev. ARCHER GURNEY. *Second Edition.* London: William Pickering. 1852.

THERE are undoubtedly certain epochs in the histories of nations, and sometimes too of the world in general, when talents and energies of classes respectively distinct, manifest themselves with a peculiar intensity. We have all heard, for instance, of the ages of Pericles, Augustus, Elizabeth, and Louis Quatorze—the latter of which has been strangely over-rated—and if we examine the subject, we shall perceive that the constellations, real or supposed, which have adorned these various periods, are not the exceptions to, but the manifestations of, an universal law, which regulates the progress of human agency, gradually preparing the world through its many strange vicissitudes, and often by means, which at first sight appear little calculated to effect their object, for that final consummation to which we appear rapidly approaching. The origin of this dispensation is of course to be sought in the inscrutable counsels of the Divine will, regulating the course of events according to the dictates of Divine wisdom. The means by which the decree is carried into effect are in some cases obvious, though still veiled with a portion of that obscurity which makes us see the things of this life, as well as those of another, through a glass darkly. It is however clear, that similar causes acting upon similar subject matter, will, under similar circumstances, produce similar effects. Such, at least, is the way in which the world speaks of these things; the more Christian, and therefore philosophical, method of expression would be, that such conjunctions and appearances are symptoms, or tokens, that the Divine will is manifesting itself in such and such a way.

Of the four epochs to which we have alluded—those of Pericles and Elizabeth may be considered as the days of the giants; whereas the eras of Augustus and Louis Quatorze were but the ages of mere mortal men.

These however, as we observed before, are not the only periods when the mind of man has developed itself with peculiar power in one or more determinate directions. We have evidence of such a manifestation even in the scriptural account of the world before the flood; we have in the sacred volume also the glorious age of Israel, from the birth of Samuel to the death of Solomon; and that equally glorious, in another point of view, when the mightiest bards that this world has ever seen, struck their divinely-tuned harps, and uttered the messages of Heaven, in the richest poetry of earth, around the falling throne of Judah.

Then look to the monuments of Assyria. Do they not speak of a golden age, the very memory of which has passed away?

Look to the annals of Egypt, written in her temples and her tombs, her pillars and her palaces. How clearly do they speak of an outburst of genius, succeeded by ages of miserable and slavish imitation.

There is another age—the mightiest probably amongst uninspired men, the age of HOMER. The restless conceit and silly scepticism of the age has endeavoured to destroy the identity, and deny the existence of the greatest of uninspired poets, and to promulgate and defend the preposterous notion, that the most perfect poem ever composed (if we except the “*Œdipus Rex*”), was the work of a succession of semi-barbarian poetasters. Such writers, we would admonish, that no amount of *minus* quantities will produce any thing affirmative; that all the witlings ever brought into the world, if they could, by some strange and fortunate instrumentality, be concentrated into one living specimen of mediocrity, would not produce a WIT; and that unity of effect is not, and cannot be, the result of multiplicity of design. No! Till the Venus de Medici is eclipsed by the result of the separate and jarring exertions of a concourse of bad workmen, till the inmates of a second-rate seminary for young ladies achieve by their concurrent, but independent and successive attempts at painting, a *chef-d'œuvre* superior to the Madonna of Carlo Dolce—till! we may go on for ever in our illustrations—will we believe that the “*Iliad*” is a sort of poetical *pot pourri*; and that Homer, instead of being the most perfect of artists, and the greatest of poets, is merely “the fortuitous concatenation of circumstances” personified.

To us it appears clear from a consideration of the subject, in part suggested by an interesting passage in Butler's reminiscences, that the “*Iliad*” is neither the work of a succession of ballad-mongers, nor the production of a solitary genius, arising in a barbarous age; but that it is the almost sole genuine relic of a high state of civilization swept away by an irruption of barbarians,

and surviving through a period of lawlessness and ignorance by means of its intrinsic excellence and general attractiveness.

Of the moral and intellectual history of the age of Homer we know little or nothing; but in the case of the ages of Pericles and Augustus, we find a phenomenon which we noticed as traceable in the monuments of Assyria and Egypt, namely, that after the human mind had reached its highest development, there soon supervened a declension both in taste and power; and this, too, seems a law, though neither so universal nor so absolute as those previously mentioned. It is not universal, since there have been golden ages that have been suddenly and instantly succeeded by epochs signalized for their utter barrenness in the precious ores of human taste and genius. It is not absolute, since even in the declension and in the general absence of mental or moral energy, there have been exceptions—men possessed of the characters of their fathers—and, as it were, born after their time.

To borrow two illustrations from that mighty book which is open to all, and where HE who *disposes* all the things we *propose*, has written the wisdom of His will, how often as we watch the waves do we see them rise gradually, till one mightier than the rest overleaps the limit attained by its predecessors, then follow lesser waves gradually decreasing, till after a lull the ferment begins once more.

In the transition from day to night, again, we have examples of both the courses indicated above; we have the glorious sunset, and the long warm twilight of the north, and the dazzling glory and sudden darkness of the south.

Many, indeed, as we have observed, have been the golden epochs of the human mind, greater or more contracted in their geographical extension, fuller or fainter in their intensity of glory, embracing some more, some fewer, branches of man's capacity.

But of these epochs there is *one* to which we have not as yet even alluded, which will rank high in the scale of reputation throughout the ages that are coming—the epoch of the French Revolution—and, strange to say, there is one man who has lived through that epoch, and outlived all the successive stars of that magnificent constellation—the poet James Montgomery.

It is curious to look back at the period of his entrance into life, and to mark the many great names connected with and flourishing at that time, and then to number up the celebrated men, his juniors, in public existence, now gathered to the grave, or silent as the tomb. For the age has passed away, the sunset is fast fading into night, its warmth, its glory are departed, gone, and gone for ever.

It was a glorious age. We are not speaking of moral worth, but of mental energy, intellectual power, and in this sense it *was* a glorious age. Let us name but a few of our own countrymen, Pitt, Fox, Canning, Burke, Burns, Byron, Moore, Scott, Shelley, Southey, Coleridge, and two of our own kings, and oh ! how many others could we name, and now they have passed away, they are all gone, and for ever, save the mightiest and noblest of them all, the matchless one, the Duke of Wellington. And we are inclined to repeat once more the *repetita crambe* of the indignant Roman—

“Terra malos homines nunc educat atque pusillos
Hos deus quicumque aspexit ridet et odit.”

In two of the departments of mental development this assuredly holds good—those of statesmanship and poetry—the most partial eyes cannot invest our late premier, for example, with the moral stature of a son of Anak. His warmest eulogists would scarcely paint him as possessed of the tact of a Pericles, the honour of a Phocion, the comprehensive mind of a Chatham, the unbending determination of a Cato, the loyalty of a Mephibosheth, or the patriotism of a Doria.

In the world of poetry things are not quite as bad, for there we have the thunder of Montgomery and the warbling of Keble, and the mysterious symphony of Williams, and the measured melody of Tennyson, to say nothing of others more or less deserving of praise or blame.

Montgomery—Robert Montgomery—is certainly a great poet ; and whatever be the fate of his other poetical works, he has written *one* at least which will live for ever—we speak of the “Christian Life.” It is, however, at present impossible to tell what will be the opinion of posterity with regard to him, whether the judges of future days will remit him the punishment due to his many glaring offences against good taste and good sense, on account of his transcendent, his overwhelming and magnificent sublimity of idea and sometimes of expression too, or whether they will, according to the well-known custom of boarding-schools, set one bad mark against many good ones.

Whatever be the charms of Keble, and they are very great and very many, we are confident that future generations will not adjudge him that high eminence which he now enjoys. His faults are in some points diametrically opposite to those of Robert Montgomery, in that whereas the author of the “Christian Life” frequently spoils what is intrinsically noble by an inelegant expression or forced phrase, the author of the “Christian Year,” on the other hand, raises in some instances a beautiful superstructure

of exquisite language upon no foundation, self-poised as it were in air. The beauties of Montgomery are at times like fountains in the desert, guarded, or rather infested, by savage beasts and unpleasant-looking reptiles. Those of Keble too frequently resemble the lovely mirage which attracts the eye but fails the tongue.

Of Williams we trust to speak more at large hereafter. We have not forgotten his "Creation," and its high claims upon the notice and admiration of the public.

As to Tennyson, though very beautiful in his way, he possesses at present an artificial and factitious eminence, which will not be accorded to him by "the age to come." He is in fact *the* poet of the day, the poet who has just struck the right chord, just hit the bull's-eye. He writes, and as it seems, both thinks and feels exactly *with*, and *for*, and *in* his age. He personifies, and expresses, and transfers to his poetical canvas the highly-educated gentleman of the nineteenth century. There is a certain nameless grace, a refined and *painfully* conscious elegance, a *savoir faire*, and a *savoir vivre*; a little philosophy, never very deep, though often affecting depth; a little Christianity, not of a very strict or practical character; a little infidelity, and a good deal of scepticism; then there is much dexterity in running the changes upon a few ideas, a proper quantity of feeling never falling into extremes, a great deal of sentiment, an immensity of sentimentalism, and not one particle of romance. Such is Tennyson, who belongs rather to the class of minstrels that hymn the praises of their liege lord in appropriate verses, than of those mightier sons of song who act as the teachers of the days they live in, or who, if they fail to do so from a moral obliquity, raise high above their contemporaries a towering monument of bold and independent genius, which lasts through revolving ages the admiration of successive generations.

Very different from either of the bards last mentioned is the poet whose name stands at the head of this article. The uncouth and extravagant phraseology which actually disgusts us at times with Montgomery, the mistiness and unreality which disappoint us in Keble, the obscurity which is observable in most of Williams's poems, and the mental mediocrity so universally cognizable in Tennyson, will never distress the readers of the poems of *Archer Gurney*. A faithful and a noble child of nature, he has tracked the steps, and watched the looks, and learnt the lore, and acquired the language of the *Magna Mater*. Let us take, however, his poems *seriatim*, discussing him and them as we go on, and reserving our fullest consideration for his latest production, the second edition of "Charles the First."

The translation of the Second Part of Faust is executed in

a most masterly style, combining that ease and accuracy which are so seldom united in compositions of this nature. It is indeed a fact which must be acknowledged by all the students of poetry, that good translations are much rarer than good poems. Of this the reasons are obvious. In the first instance it requires a great poet to render a great poem, and great poets prefer for the most part producing original works of their own to translating those of others. Then, again, it is very difficult for a stranger to enter fully into the conceptions of an author, especially a poet; and in as far as he fails to do so will he fail to succeed in translating his works. And, lastly, when to these requisites, so rare in themselves, is added that the translator must be a perfect master both of the language which he translates from and of that into which he renders his original, we perceive causes amply sufficient to account for the great dearth of good translations so observable in our own as well as other languages.

It is not therefore surprising that there should be no English translations from the classic poets worthy of the name except the *Æneid* by Dryden, and a few exquisite fragments by Milton: for we presume that no one will venture to cite as evidence to the contrary the *Iliad* of Pope, which, whatever be its excellencies, is most undoubtedly *not* the *Iliad* of Homer.

It is no mean praise then to Archer Gurney that he should have commenced his poetical career by rendering into English, with all the force, and life, and mystic power, and nameless grace of the original, that very wonderful and noble poem, the Second Part of *Faust*.

The essay with which he has introduced this work to the English reader is in itself most interesting and instructive, and shows a clearness of conception and a grasp of mind which prepare us for the achievement of great things.

“ Whilst the beauty of detached scenes and passages (says he in the Second Part of ‘*Faust*’), can be denied by none, many are of opinion that little positive meaning, scarcely any thing of a fixed tendency, no lesson for good or evil, can be gleaned from that extraordinary work. It is contended, that it is a conglomeration of scenes, each of which, separately and by itself, must be allowed to possess great merit, but which are not sufficiently connected with one another to form one complete whole. I do not share this opinion; and I will endeavour in as few words as may be, to explain what I consider to have been the author’s plan and object in this truly wonderful production. In order to do this, I shall be compelled to notice briefly the First Part of *Faust*, of which the work now immediately before us is but the sequel and conclusion.

“ *Faust*, then, in the First Part, is represented as a professor in a

German university, who, after the toil and study of many years, has arrived at the conclusion, that he has laboured in vain, and that all knowledge is vanity. Stung to the soul by this reflection, he dreams of plunging into the vortex of pleasure and dissipation, and of enjoying earth at least, as he can discover or fathom nothing beyond it. He is in this mood when the spirit of evil, Mephistopheles, seeks his presence, and, falling into Faust's own train of thought, assures him that all knowledge is vain and profitless, and that pleasure is the only good. This pleasure he offers with youth, love, and beauty; and all that he demands as the price of those glorious benefits is the soul of Faust in the after-world, if after-world there be. Faust assents to this proposition, on the condition that Mephistopheles serve him, as his slave, until he has succeeded in making his master so perfectly happy, that he shall call on the passing moment to stay, exclaiming, 'Linger, thou art so beautiful!' If Mephistopheles does not succeed in this, his time and pains are to be given for naught. To this condition the devil accedes, and accordingly a bond to that effect is signed by Faust, in his own blood, as ink. It should be observed that Mephistopheles calculates much more on the opportunity thus afforded him for plunging Faust into the abyss of sensual sin, than on the parchment bond, which, after all, was a mere form of ceremony: for it is not to be supposed that any mortal should have the power of thus bargaining away his own soul. However, the bond is signed, the bargain is concluded, and Mephistopheles commences his labours by giving youth and beauty to Faust again. The latter soon sees a simple, artless maiden, with whom he falls in love; but this passion being merely sensual, and unaccompanied by any deep mental emotions, indeed scarcely deserves the name of love. Yet Margaret (this is the maiden's name) is deceived by it. She, the type of all innocence and purity, falls from her high estate, and becomes the victim of the seducer. In the mean time, Faust, far from feeling any real pleasure in his conquest, is devoured by remorse and agony. He condemns himself as a heartless fiend, and yet, having once yielded to the voice of temptation, having once started on the downward path, he finds it impossible to retrace his steps,—he sinks yet deeper and deeper in sin. The end of this criminal passion is death and misery. Margaret, maddened by her agony of spirit, destroys her child, and expires in the dungeon from which Faust has vainly besought her to fly. Thus the First Part concludes. Faust is borne away by Mephistopheles, and the voice of Margaret is heard from above, calling him back to the paths of love and light, but as yet vainly.

"In the Second Part of this great work, we find him resolving to forget the past, and to start again on his search for happiness and joy. Some time has probably elapsed since the death of Margaret, and he issues on the world once more, under the guidance of Mephistopheles, eager for new pleasures, new delights. But still his desire is not pure and truly noble—he still seeks for happiness *only*, and not for virtue—he still would attain his goal by sensual means. Mephistopheles leads him to the court of the Emperor of Germany. There, to please the

monarch, Faust summons the shades of Helen and Paris from Hades, and, gazing on these two in a scene of dumb courtship, which they perform before the assembled court, he falls wildly in love with Helen, and attempts to grasp the shadow. Of course, this inroad on nature's laws is attended by defeat; the spirits vanish in smoke, and Faust falls senseless. The character of Helen here first introduced to our notice, forms a perfect contrast to that of Margaret in the First Part. The latter was the type of mental purity and beauty—Helen is the representative of sensual loveliness carried to its furthest point of perfection. Margaret is the maiden of the romantic—Helen the beauty of the classic age. The former's charms lie in her exquisite Christian purity of spirit—the latter's chief excellence is her irresistible loveliness, her marvellous grace. Thus Faust was far more likely to attain goodness in loving Margaret than in adoring Helen, had not his soul been unable to comprehend and fathom the former's true superiority. As he has wandered from the *true* ideal, he naturally seeks compensation in the *false*, which lies nearer to him, and which he can more easily understand. Let it not be forgotten, however, that from the beginning, the Almighty Himself had allowed Mephistopheles to tempt his creature to sin, and had anticipated Faust's final triumph over the wiles of the evil one.

“ To resume: Mephistopheles bears Faust, in his swoon, to his old professional study, and thence proceeds with him and a strange sprite named Homunculus, to the classical Walpurgis night. It would be useless to dilate here on the various concomitant events which led to this final result. I will but mention that all the ghosts of the classic ages were supposed to assemble on the plains of Pharsalia, on one night in the year, and that it was naturally expected Faust might be able to gain surer tidings of his new idol, Helen, there than elsewhere. There, too, he *does* hear of her, and is introduced by Manto, the daughter of Æsculapius, into the realms of Pluto, where Orpheus entered of old. In that dark region does Faust seek and find his Helen, and by wondrous power he thence draws her back to earth again. By so doing, he confounds all time, and we consequently find Helen returning from Troy once more, and sent on before with her maidens by Menelaus, to prepare the altar for a sacrifice. It is not needful here to tell by what means she is induced to take refuge in the palace of Faust, who appears as a barbarian chieftain. Suffice to say, that she does so, and that they are subsequently united by Hymen's bonds. The child, which is the pledge of their union, soon falls a victim to its own audacity; Helen then returns to Hades, and Faust is once more left alone. The moral conveyed by this allegory may be easily comprehended. The bonds of sensual love are lightly broken, and beauty unaccompanied by true virtue, cannot be expected to prove true to its deluded worshipper. Thus Faust finds the pleasures of mere sensual bliss fleeting and vain; they afford him no real content even in possession, and leave regret and satiety behind them. We are now approaching the end of this great poem. The crisis of Faust's fate has arrived. He forms the design of gaining a

vast tract of country from the ocean, and in consequence of the magic aid afforded by him to the emperor in a battle, he is constituted lord of all the land he may thus be enabled to secure. With the aid of Mephistopheles, who is of course compelled to serve him, he carries this design into execution, and invites the inhabitants of the neighbouring countries to take possession of the newly-conquered soil. He sees a happy and free people thus called by him into existence; and whilst he gazes on this scene of his successful labours, he feels a moment of true content and felicity, and in that moment expires. But in dying he has found the grand secret of happiness—he has discovered that the feeling of having made our fellow-creatures happy is the true key to joy; and thus in forfeiting, he has, as it were, redeemed his bond—in losing he has gained. The will of Heaven is accomplished—the anticipation of the Almighty is realized. Through sin and sorrow the labouring mortal has at last penetrated to the fountain of charity—he has made the great object of religion his own, and thus the goal of happiness is attained.”—pp. i.—iv.

Mr. Gurney goes on to point out the beauties and the blemishes of the great work which he is about to introduce to the English public,—the poetic power, the artistic skill, the moral lesson, and the moral error of Goethe's “Faust.”

It is scarcely possible to give an adequate idea, or indeed any idea at all of this wonderful production, without allotting a far greater space than we can afford to it. There are some poets as well as painters whose works cannot be appreciated except in the whole piece. There are indeed few, very few, who combine at once the finish of a Teniers with the conception of a Salvator Rosa.

We take however the opening of the first scene, not because it has any peculiar excellence—indeed the beauty and the glory of the poem increase each step that we advance—but that, being as it were at the nearest extremity, the entrance of the poem, it is less absolutely dependent upon the context.

“A beautiful landscape. Twilight. FAUST lying on a flowery bank, tired, restless, and endeavouring to sleep. A number of graceful little sprites move in airy circles around him.

“ARIEL.

“SONG—accompanied by *Æolian harps*.

“When o'er the landscape, charming Spring
Weeps 'mid her smiles in gentle showers,
And fragrant opening blossoms fling
Their varied sweets from gay wild flowers,

The evil and the good have rights
On your protection,—then to man,
Afford ye little elfin sprites,
Whatever friendly aid ye can!—

“While hovering yon poor mortal's head around,
Fulfil your duties as good fairies bound—
Assuage the furious conflict in his heart,
Heal the keen wounds of memory's fatal dart;
With cunning spells lull sorrow's wintry blast,
And teach him blest oblivion of the past.”

After a few more lines we have—

“CHORUS OF FAIRIES.

“When the gentle dew's descend
On flowerets fann'd by evening's gale,
And the twilight shades extend
In floating mists o'er hill and dale;
Then gently elves his eyelids close,
Fair childhood's dreams revive awhile,
Still sweetly whisper soft repose,
And life of all its woes beguile.—

“Night now shrouds the blue serene,
Stars burst forth with golden glare;
Great and little lights are seen
Gleaming here and sparkling there,—
Gleaming in the lake reflected,
Sparkling in the vaulted sky,
While by Nature's law directed,
Rides the pale chaste moon on high.

“The darksome hours of night are o'er,
Its pains, its pleasures now have fled.
Mortal! thou wilt revive once more;
Morn's glowing beams play round thine head.
Lo yon slender willows bending,
Cast their shadows soft for thee,
And the corn in waves ascending,
Sweeps o'er the hills a restless sea.

“Wouldst thou each fond wish obtain,
Gaze on yonder prospect fair!
From thee shake sleep's brittle chain—
Though closely linked, 'tis thin as air!
Fear not thou to scale the wall
Which others bound by custom shun;
He who would rise should dread no fall—
Follow the impulse, and 'tis done.”—pp. 1—3.

We shall content ourselves with one more extract from this very singular and very interesting piece.

" DRUNKEN MAN (*reeling*).

- " Let 's be jovial all and hearty !
 See I'm frank, and fresh, and free ;
 Songs and jests pass round our party,
 We'll be joyous company.
 Then I'll drink, and drink, and drink,—
 Clash your glasses !—tink-a-tink !
 Let them clash, and let them sound,—
 Pass the merry goblet round.
- " Though my wife has raved and ranted,
 Though she's torn my coat in two,
 When I lightly gallivanted,
 When I term'd her jade and shrew,—
 Still I'll drink, and drink, and drink,—
 Clash your glasses !—tink-a-tink !
 Seize them, maskers !—let them sound !
 Pass the merry goblet round.
- " Don't suspect that I be tipsy,
 Think not all my cash is paid ;
 Should my Hostess prove a gipsy,
 I'll get brandy from the Maid.
 Still I'll drink, and drink, and drink,—
 Come, ye villains ! tink-a-tink !
 One to one your glasses sound,—
 Pass the merry goblet round.
- " Pleasures all are sweet, but flying ;
 Tame discretion ! you're a bore :
 Let me lie though where I'm lying,
 For I now can stand no more.

" CHORUS.

- " Every brother, drink, and drink !
 Shout and clash your tink-a-tink !
 To your seats be firmly bound,
 He's a fool who bites the ground."—pp. 24, 25.

But enough of this spirited and living translation of one of the most striking productions of German genius. Pass we now to *Love's Legends*, a series of three poetical tales, the character of which is well expressed by the title.—*ADHEMAR'S Vow*, the first of these poems, is a wild and spirited legend of the days of Charles Martel. The peculiarity of the metre will, perhaps, prevent its gaining that popularity which it might otherwise attain.

This piece, however, as well as the other two, aims at no high excellence. The volume—a pretty little green volume—is rather the holiday sport, than the appointed task of a poet; but as such it has great merit. The first legend opens thus:—

- “ They come o’er the mountains, they come o’er the sea,
The Saracen host in their pride;
From east and from west, from each Paynim countree,
They throng like to locusts that cover the lea,
And Christendom’s lords are defied.
Oh! if Heaven in its grace should not merciful be,
In vain will earth’s Saviour have died.
- “ Spain is theirs, Spain, the land of the vine and the dance,
Now onward the host’s billows roll;
Beneath the keen sabre is shivered the lance;
And lo! they have reach’d thee, dear, beautiful France,
Of chivalrous valour the soul.
Soon, soon, through thy gates may their wild coursers prance;
Soon, soon, may the foe reach his goal.
- “ Yet, no! there are hearts which still beat for the fight,
One chief who may break the dark spell;
Who may teach these proud Paynims so haught in their might,
That Heaven by its chosen will vindicate right,
And baffle the counsels of hell.
Ay, France hath full many a chivalrous knight,
And their leader art thou—Charles Martel.”—pp. 1, 2.

There is a freshness, a vigour, a life about these lines which is very pleasing, and which is peculiarly refreshing, after the obscure asperity of Browning, the painful polish of Tennyson, the wearisome sameness of Taylor, the palling sweetness of Keble, and the ostentatious—pardon us for coining a new word—the ostentatious *simplicitativeness* of Wordsworth. The poem is, indeed, from first to last a mere trifle; but it is a trifle which Scott or Southey need not have been ashamed of, and which may well occupy the leisure hour of the student, or arrest the attention of the young and the imaginative.

The second piece in this collection, Bertha, composed in octosyllabic metre, though sweet and touching, is decidedly inferior to its predecessor. Much of it, indeed, ought to be re-written. There are, however, many very pretty passages; take for example the following; the author is speaking of his heroine:

- “ But, lo, the hour approaches now,
When all her sleeping buds shall waken,
Alas! the storm the flower may bow,
And all those buds to earth be shaken.

For wake she must! Oh! deem not ye
 Who list his lay, the bard would fain
 Fair beauty's flower unopen'd see,
 So saved from wind, and blight, and rain.
 No! here on earth its fate must be
 To bloom, perchance to fade again.
 So be it! To his angels God
 A life of prayer and praise hath given.
 Mortals must *strive* ere 'neath the sod,
 Their frames await the call to heaven."—p. 62.

The third legend will probably be more popular than either of its predecessors, possessing more outward attractions than the first, and more intrinsic merit than the second. It has not, indeed, the bold originality of tone and temper which characterize Adhemar's Vow, but it is most exquisitely graceful as well as musical, and richly adorned with the flowers of fancy. Both the second, however, and the third too often remind one of Lalla Rookh. The plot of the Peri is, nevertheless, as far as we know, entirely original; and the conception is beautifully executed.

But far superior to any thing discoverable in Love's Legends are the detached poems with which, from time to time, the author of Charles the First enriched the pages of an ephemeral periodical, entitled the "British Churchman."

Our first quotation shall be a very graceful poem, entitled—

"THE YOUNG NUN'S DREAM.

I.

"I have said farewell,
 A last farewell,
 To all the flowers
 I loved so well;
 To my father's home
 And my sister dear,
 And now I must languish
 In sorrow here.

"Oh! let me weep
 For the dear, dear past,
 For childhood's dreams
 Which may not last,
 For all my pleasures
 And sorrows flown—
 Oh! leave me to mourn them,
 Alone, alone.

" My sister has told me
 In smiles and tears,
Of her maiden hopes
 And her maiden fears.
I know that the zephyrs
 The young flowers kiss,
That love is their lot,
 And that love is bliss.

II.

" What this should mean
 I know not well ;
And must not now
 On these follies dwell.
The word was spoken,
 The hour is past,
The veil of the convent
 Around me cast.

" And now I must languish
 In sorrow here,
The cell is cold,
 The night is drear ;
And at yon casement
 Dark forms I see,
Which pass, and gibe,
 And frown on me.

" Silence ; deep silence ;
 Hark ! that soft strain !
No, all is hush'd
 In sleep again.
And yet it rises !
 Is this a dream ?
What misty vapours
 Around me stream ?

III.

" Darkness is round me ;
 Wild clouds entwine ;
Save me, O Mary,
 Mother divine !
Lo ! a star 'mid the vapours,
 Breaks through the night ;
They are hurl'd aside
 'Neath its rays of light.

“What ! see I rightly ?—
 A myrtle bower,
 Where gleams in its beauty
 Each summer flower ;
 And a maiden fair,
 Lost in reverie sweet ;
 And her lover, young lover,
 Lies there at her feet ?

“And upward he gazes,
 Their arms entwine ;
 She murmurs, all faintly,
 ‘For ever thine !’
 Their lips are meeting—
 Her face I see—
 Ha ! maiden, young maiden !
 He kisses—*me*.

IV.

“Changed is the vision,
 Cold is the brow ;
 A simple chamber
 Before me now.
 With love in each motion,
 And peaceful content,
 O’er the sleeping babe
 Is the mother bent.

“And he wakes, that young child,
 From his calm repose ;
 Like the sweet peach-blossom,
 His fair cheek glows.
 She bends to kiss him,
 Her face I see—
 Ha ! mother ! young mother !
 He smiles on—*me*.

“Changed is the vision :
 Pale, pale is my hue ;
 The couch of sickness,
 Of death I view ;
 And on it a matron
 Now breathes her last,
 And the tears of her children
 Fall thick and fast.

V.

“ They kneel for her blessing ;
 She smiles once more,
 Then sinks in death's slumber :
 Her toils are o'er.
 Past, past for ever !
 Her face I see—
 Ha ! matron, cold matron !
 They gaze on—*me*.

“ And hark as I tremble
 In doubt and fear,
 Those accents unearthly,
 That reach mine ear !—
 ‘ Yes, thou wert the maiden,
 The mother wert thou,
 The dying matron :
 What *art* thou now ?’

“ ‘ The joys that were destined
 For thee by Heaven,
 The flowers that to glad thee
 On earth were given.
 They were scatter'd and wither'd
 By fate's cold blast,
 And their faint dreams only
 Before thee pass'd.’

VI.

“ Now all is silence
 Around again ;
 Past are the vapours,
 Sunk is the strain.
 Oh ! all my sorrows
 And joys have flown ;
 Leave me to mourn them,
 Alone, alone !”

Surely there are few more exquisite things to be found amongst the fugitive poetry of any language than this little piece ; it combines, indeed, the grace of Anacreon, with the elegance of Catullus, whilst the pearl-like dewdrops of poetic fancy with which it is besprent, glisten with the mysterious glory of a higher and a better world.

Our next extract shall be of a very different class. We have a peculiar affection for it, as being the first of Mr. Gurney's poems which came under our notice. Well do we remember the

exulting admiration with which we at once hailed the appearance of a really great poet; the deep thankfulness with which we welcomed the arrival on the battle-field of a champion, both willing and able to combat for the ancient faith against every adversary :—

“ THE MARTYRS.

“ Oh, holy faith! Oh, Christian love!

What blest, what sacred power had ye
To raise the soul to heaven above,
And wean from earthly misery!
With what sublime and holy pride
For you the ancient martyrs died,
When chanting of your glory bright
They hail'd with gladness earthly night!

“ Oh, holy saints, to you I bow:

With worship, not ;—forbid it, Heaven!
But with such reverence all allow
To those to whom a crown is given:
And yours were crowns of heavenly bliss,—
And may I honour not for this?

“ Smiling on earth and heaven ye died,

Bright rapture beaming in your eyes:
Ye saw, whilst gush'd your blood's red tide,
Your loving Saviour in the skies.
Around the Pagan foemen frown'd,
To mark your woe in that fell hour;
And ye, with grace and glory crown'd,
Hail'd death as God's most precious dower.

“ And therefore doth it fill my heart

With holy joy on you to gaze.
Oh, never from my breast depart
The memory of your early days,
When smiled the Church through dark distress
A rose amidst the wilderness.

“ Though *she* that Church's lying child

Her poison casts o'er every flower;
And myriads falsely hath beguiled
To give you more than mortal power,
To think the Lord your aid requires
To save us from destruction's fires,
Lowly to you to bend the knee,
And crave your *benedicite*:

- " Yet holy saints, not honour'd less
 Be ye whom she as idols knows :
Not yours but God's it is to bless,
 And grace from Him in danger flows.
Ye bend with angels round his throne,
But HE is God and LORD alone !
- " Then, blessed martyrs, let me pray
 That God may grant me thoughts like yours !
Sweet love that soars in endless day,
 And faith that pangs and woes endures.
O, dare I ask on earth to yield
A shade of what ye thus reveal'd,
As warrior bold for truth and right,
And guard of faith, Heaven's holy light !
- " Thus then to you in soul I bow :
 With worship, not ;—forbid it, Heaven !
But with the reverence all allow
 To those to whom the crown is given.
Ye praise your God in realms above,
The Church's stars of faith and love ! "

This is as fine in execution as it is sublime in thought, sound in principle, and noble in feeling. From the many beautiful poems before us, we select the following as being rather different in form and style, whilst it is an equally glorious manifestation of sound and earnest Anglicanism :—

**" ON THE SACRIFICE OF DAILY PRAISE AND PRAYER IN THE
ANGLO-CATHOLIC COMMUNION.**

- " Priests and rulers, favoured mortals,
 Placed by Heaven your brethren o'er,
Open wide your temples' portals
 To the lowly and the poor !
Duly thus at morn and even,
 Let the song of praise arise,
Bearing to most gracious Heaven
 Earth's most lowly sacrifice :
Hallelujah ! Hallelujah ! Let your anthems reach the skies !
- " Day by day the prayer be wafted,
 Mourning folly lust and pride ;
Day by day be deeper grafted,
 Love of JESUS and the Bride !
Thus when they who sleep awaken
 At the last dread trumpet's call ;
May each penance here partaken
 As a heavenly blessing fall !
Hallelujah ! Hallelujah ! Lord protect thy children all !

" Weak our strain to tell the glory
 Of those endless joys above !
 Lord, in tears we kneel before Thee,
 Speak and praise Thee best in love.
 Dearer than all bardic praises,
 Is one lowly sinner's prayer ;
 Where the Church her banner raises,
 Blessed JEsus, 'Thou art there !
 Hallelujah ! Hallelujah ! All in all thy praise declare !

" Duly thus, at morn and even,
 Let the Church, that wars below,
 Point by prayers the way to Heaven,
 Lull to rest her wintry woe.
 All the mighty, all the lowly,
 Thus by prayer may hers be made ;
 More than earth's discourse most holy
 May the humble prayer persuade.
 Hallelujah ! Hallelujah ! Daily prayer, we seek thine aid.

" So when morn in beauty glances
 Over earth by light to bless,
 So when shadowy eve advances
 In her lowly tenderness,
 Rise our prayers and swell our praises
 To the Eternal Three in One,
 Whilst the glorious Godhead gazes
 On the sacrifice begun.
 Hallelujah ! Hallelujah ! Thus the Church's goal be won !"

This is really a magnificent ode ; the sweep of thought and
 the sweep of song flow on together in the full majesty of lofty
 genius, and the full beauty of consummate art.

Our last choice must be from another class.

" *To all Roman Catholic Wanderers from the Church's Fold,
 whether in England or Ireland.*

" Oh, brethren, erring brethren,
 Who have pledged your faith to Rome,
 Come back, come back, we pray ye
 To your home ! to your home—
 To the Church which loved your fathers,
 The Church whose fall they mourn'd,
 Which holy Paul hath planted,
 And blessed saints adorn'd.
 Come back ! Come back !

“ Your sacred Mother is she ;
 She claims your duty's troth.
 Her sons ye are ; not freedmen.
 Oh be both ! Oh be both !
 Claim, claim your ancient birthright,
 The ancient bond restore :
 Serve not her foreign rival,
 But serve your Church once more.
 Come back ! Come back !

“ She hath mourn'd your loss in sorrow,
 She hath Rachel's bearing kept.
 Awake, arise, my brethren !
 Long ye slept ! Long ye slept !
 Oh ! when once the bond of union
 Thus shall blend you with our train,
 Shall the Church in bridal gladness,
 Be a joyous Church again.
 Come back ! Come back !

“ By every British martyr
 That baffled Pagan powers,
 By Laud, by Charles the Faithful,
 Come, be ours ! Come, be ours.
 Yes, kneel ye at your fathers' shrine,
 Above your fathers' sod :
 Be your prayers once more your brethren's,
 Be our God once more your God.
 Come back ! Come back ! ”

We would fain add an exquisitely touching “ *Lament for those who have deserted the Catholic Communion of the Church, betrayed by the Romish Heresy to their ruin ;* ” and also a striking and most valuable composition, entitled “ *The Doubters' Song,* ” but we have already cited a sufficient number of these beautiful poems, and must bid them adieu for the present, with the earnest hope that their author will ere long give them to the world, in the form of a collection of original pieces.

Thus have we followed our author through his earlier career—thus have we seen that career commence with the comprehension and translation of the mighty work of a mighty master—proceed through the flowery maze of poetic fancy, and attain a lofty summit of lyrical excellence. We now enter upon the consideration of that poem, which after this long course of minstrel training he has given to the public, and of which a second and carefully-revised edition is now before us—an edition to which he has prefixed various well-chosen praises of his hero from the writings of English poets, followed by a spirited proem of his own, calling

for the sympathy of the wise and the good, and challenging the censure of the foolish and the wicked.

Ere we proceed, however, to examine the work which lies before us, it will be necessary for us to offer a few remarks in explanation of those principles of criticism upon which we adjudge their several titles of merit, to poets in general, and dramatists in particular.

Poets, who really deserve that sacred name, may be divided into five great classes, or ranks of merit, corresponding in some degree to the five ranks of the British peerage. In all cases—in every case, a poet is to be judged and allotted to his appointed station—not by circumstantial or hypothetical, but by direct and positive evidence—not by any supposition of what he might have been, or ought to have been, but by a knowledge of what he is; and this knowledge must be acquired and substantiated, not by a contemplation of his mental faculties, but by a perusal of his actual works.

It may seem needless to lay down such a rule; and yet how often do we find the admirers of genius arguing in favour of a man's right to such and such a rank in the peerage of poetry, *from his supposed capability against his actual failure!* We do not wish to undervalue genius—without, indeed, the highest genius, none can attain to the highest excellence: but native genius is not all that is required either for the higher or the lower grades of the minstrel aristocracy. The aspirant to poetic fame may possess a certain portion of either the *ingenium* or the *mens divini*, and yet be devoid of professional art, or critical judgment, or delicacy of taste, or industry, or perseverance, or—that most necessary of all things in poetry as well as in life—common sense. To make a really great poet, we require also, besides all these qualifications, not only sublimity of thought and beauty of description, but vastness of conception and unity of design. Those who possess these merits, and who have left behind them the proofs that they do so in their works, they, and they only, deserve the first rank in the peerage of Parnassus.

It is necessary, then, that each first-rate poet must have produced at least *one* first-rate poem—other parts of his works may be brought forward to increase his laurels and augment his glory; but to obtain a seat on the highest bench in the poetic senate—the Patres Conscripti of the realm of song—he must produce at least one poem in which the loftiest excellence of inward vision has been manifested in the fullest perfection of outward reality.

Judged by this rule, how few will attain to the ducal coronet in this our house of minstrel peers—Shakespeare, indeed, will be

there, and Homer, and Sophocles, and Schiller, and Æschylus—and Goethe; but they will have few assessors.

Even Milton will receive no more than a marquise; for the magnificence of more than half of “Paradise Lost” will not make up for the dulness and puerility of other portions; nor could any conceivable beauty of detail atone for an inherent defect of design. And we conceive that even his warmest admirers would scarcely stake Comus (undoubtedly his most perfect poem) against the Prometheus Vinctus, the Œdipus Rex, or any of the great dramas of Shakespeare.

Beside Milton will be placed all those who, while possessed of first-rate powers, have not accomplished first-rate excellence—whether from a defect of nature or of art it matters not—yet who have left behind them works, that though inferior to the *chefs-d'œuvre* of the greatest bards, raise them high above the rivalry of those below. In fact, our poetical marquise may be considered as a *first class under the line*. To this rank would belong Lucretius, passages of whose De Rerum Natura outweigh all the other poets of his country put together. And there, too, would be Dryden, whose actual sin it is that he is not in the first grade, and whose Alexander's Feast alone were sufficient to ensure him the rank which we have awarded.

The next class is totally distinct from those previously mentioned, and includes poets who have attained to a high excellence, but of a decidedly inferior order—who have reached the highest point of which they were capable, and produced a secondary perfection beneath indeed those above them, but secure from all competition from below, a perfection including comprehensiveness of design, unity of effect, and beauty of detail. Such are Euripides, Virgil, Tasso, Southey, Scott, and Spenser.

Below these, and separated from them by an impassable chasm, we find a class of poets who, while far superior to the generality of bards, are wanting in either that vastness of mind, or vigour of intellect, or power of imagination, or poetic fire, or poetic art, which belong to the three higher ranks—such are Pope, and Gray, and Thomson, and Crabbe, and Milman, and Isaac Williams, and Horace, and Ovid, and Moore—and Burns, and Ramsay.

In the baronage of bards would figure many a name worshipped during the brief day of its ascendancy—Cowley would hold a high place there, and dispute precedence with Anacreon; with them would rank the graceful Tennyson, and the rugged Collins, and the gentle Keble, and the unhappy Cowper, and the nervous Campbell, and the melodious Beattie; and beneath them would sit the plaintive Shenstone, and the elegant Catullus, and the hearty

Dibdin, and many a poet, both sacred and profane, of the seventeenth century.

Beneath these noble bards—these Patricians of Helicon—this genuine aristocracy of Parnassus, there is an innumerable host of smaller wits, to whom courtesy or custom gives the minstrel name, or perhaps they may be considered rather in the light of citizens, though not senators of Delphi; acknowledged by Apollo as liegemen, but not lords of his dominion; or returning to English imagery (alas! we ourselves are sinning against all the rigid rules of our art, and confounding classical with “barbarian” appellations; and yet why not, since both the lords and commons of our state number “barbarians” as well as Greeks and Latins in their roll): returning to English imagery, though possessed of no constitutional powers, or legal rights, they have a decided position in society, and may be considered as the “ladies and gentlemen” of Parnassus.

Even here we must create a decided distinction; erect a baronetage, and admit to its honours such worthy candidates as Martin Farquhar Tupper, whose charming freshness we have already noticed, and perhaps—but on this we have grave doubts—Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, and others of the same prize poem class.

Thus much for poets in general. Now for dramatists in particular. The drama, as its very name imports, represents, or appears to represent action. There are, however, various classes of poetical composition which, with more or less accuracy, lay claim to the dramatic title. Our remarks apply only to tragedy.

Thus there is the *mystical* drama, in which the outward semblance of representation is employed, as the most convenient and attractive medium by which to convey the fable, allegory, moral, or other conception existing in the author's mind; such are the Prometheus of Æschylus, the Comus of Milton, the Faust of Goethe, and the Manfred of Byron.

Then there is what may be called the *artificial* drama, in which the dramatic form is adopted to exhibit a narrative in the most striking manner; such is that very beautiful poem, the Belshazzar of Milman.

But besides these and other kinds of compositions, which adopt the dramatic form, with more or less of the dramatic character and spirit, but without any claim or pretension to dramatic reality: there is also another species of representative fiction, to which the name *dramatic* pertains in its fullest and strictest sense, inasmuch as it represents, or endeavours to represent to the very life the thoughts, and feelings, and passions, and

words, and actions of human beings ; it is, in fact, not the narration, description, copy or similitude, shadow or reflection of human nature or human life ; but it is the actual realization of man's inner being manifesting itself in outward action, and pouring itself forth in appropriate language—and this not of one, but of many—not confusedly, but according to a certain order, congruity, and design, through which the most perfect art at once guides and subserves the most perfect nature, acting apparently under the pressure of an inherent and absolute necessity.

Such are the universal, the unalienable characteristics of the real and genuine DRAMA.

It is not enough then to collect fine sentiments, and dazzling imagery, and to tell an interesting story by the mouths of a convenient number of men and women, hired for the occasion. All this, and much more than this, does not constitute dramatic excellence.

Let us go back to our masters the Greeks, and learn from them. What is it that constitutes the charm of a Greek tragedy ? It is, that it combines the fullest and freest action of nature with the most perfect and studied rules of art ; it is, that, whilst each circumstance that occurs conduces to the general effect, and ministers to the appointed end, whilst each word that falls from the lips of each actor has its value and its meaning, its interest and its attraction ; all those circumstances and words might have occurred in real life, nay, *must* have occurred under the given conditions of the plot.

Now, without any hesitation, we re-assert our judgment that the poet who acts upon these principles, and successfully carries them out, *is* a dramatist ; whilst he who disregards them, or fails in the attempt to realize them, *is not* a dramatist.

It is not enough then, with Seneca, to look out an old story, adorn or encumber it with a plentiful portion of philosophy, and serve the whole up in a series of dialogues : nor with Addison, to compose a certain number of set speeches, and apportion them to the various dramatis personæ : nor with Dryden, to give the free rein to a powerful imagination, and pour forth a succession of brilliant passages through the lips of fictitious personages : nor with Rowe and Otway, to paint every portrait in the most glowing, or rather glaring colours, and bedeck them with all the jewellery that comes to hand : nor with Corneille and Racine, to introduce a given quantity of ladies and gentlemen dressed in the most elegant mummy cloths, and make them recite their parts like school children before the holidays : nor with Henry Taylor, to collect the materials of a very interesting *narrative* poem, and then cut them up into enormously long speeches.

No ! none of these processes will produce a genuine drama, or entitle the manufacturer engaged in them to the title of a true dramatist.

It will be evident also from what we have already said, that the true dramatist must move out of himself. Other poets may remain within themselves, and survey the object on which they are about to operate *ab extra*, or they may absorb it into themselves till it becomes subjectively united with their inner being. The dramatist, on the other hand, must place himself in the position of his personages : he must not make them act or speak as *he* would have acted or spoken ; but, as *they* would have acted and spoken, so must *he* act and speak for them. Of course, like the painter, he may avail himself of the most favourable light, but he must go no further ; the forms, the colours must be true to nature, and the light too.

It is on this ground that the *Revenge of Young*, despite its dramatic power, can scarcely be said to have achieved dramatic excellence, being rather a vivid reflection of life on the mental tablet of its author, and thus imbued with his own individuality, than a genuine representation of life itself.

It is on this ground, also, that the greatest poet of the last age had well nigh failed of the dramatic laurel. We need scarcely say that we allude to BYRON. Yet, strange, passing strange though it be, so convinced was he of the truth of those principles which we are advocating, those rules which we have laid down, that, miserable egotist as he was, he successfully struggled with the evil influence, burst through (alas ! but for a moment) the chain of *self* with which his whole soul was generally fettered, and produced *SARDANAPALUS*, the noblest monument of his mighty genius, and that which gives him a right to the *strawberry leaves* of Parnassus. He has also written one other genuine drama ; we allude to the exquisite *Werner*, which should be read and studied by all those who seek to attain, or even understand, dramatic excellence.

Judged by these tests, even Browning, whose dramatic ardours we have been amongst the few unprejudiced critics to discover and to proclaim, will scarcely receive the tragic garland. Nay, in one respect he is infinitely less dramatic than even Henry Taylor. For it is possible to conceive a multitude of real personages prosing one after the other, whilst it is *not* possible to imagine them possessing the peculiarity of mind, or adopting the peculiarity of diction, which distinguish the author of *The Blot on the Scutcheon*. The greatest fault of Henry Taylor is, not that his personages are addicted to prosing, but that, for the most part, they all prose exactly in the same way. And this, despite

the many beauties of Philip Van Artevelde, is decidedly tiresome, besides being anti-dramatic.

Let us explain our meaning by an illustration from common life. We have often travelled for long hours in a public conveyance with companions whose conversation partook of the faults though not the merits of Taylor; nay, perhaps one of them may have interspersed his long speeches with poetical images and philosophical sentiments. But let the reader imagine to himself—for we cannot—falling in with a company of Brownings, of various ages, sexes, and conditions. Were such a prodigy to befall us, we should distrust the evidence of our senses, and adopt the persuasion that we were suffering under one of those singular delusions which have been of late years brought before the notice of the public.

It is clear, then, granting our premises, and that they must be granted there is no doubt, if a reference be allowed to the greatest masters of the ungentle craft, to the practice of the greatest of acknowledged dramatists, and to those principles of nature and reason by which the one have been guided in their judgments, and the other in their performances, that since the Elizabethan age England has produced scarcely a single dramatist, nay, scarcely a solitary drama. With the exception of the Werner and Sardana-palus of Byron, we know of no tragedy fully deserving the name in its strictest sense, except that touching, beautiful, highly artistic, exquisitely natural, and intensely dramatic poem, the DOUGLAS of HOME. It really makes our blood boil, when we recollect that the author was degraded from his *quasi* clerical character by the barbarians of the Scottish Kirk for presuming to perpetrate that exquisite drama.

In announcing, therefore, our conviction that ARCHER GURNEY fully deserves the title of a dramatist, in its highest and strictest sense, we are allotting to him no common or every-day distinction, but one which he shares with few, few of the sons of song, and fewer still of his own countrymen. Such, indeed, is our conviction; and in support thereof we refer our readers to his Charles the First. In this poem, all that we have demanded as essential to the highest excellence of a drama, meets us in its fulness:—grandeur of conception, unity of design, agreement of parts, progress of events, distinct *personality* of character, reality of action, inner life and outward manifestation of independent being, propriety of diction, verisimilitude of manners, the beauty of nature and the beauty of art, simplicity, sublimity, pathos, power—all these are the characteristics of the poem before us; a poem which places its author *at least* on a par with the writer of *The Medea*.

Before supporting our commendation by extracts, we must observe on two peculiarities in the poem under consideration.

It is, in the first place, a really national and historical poem. Strangely enough, since the days of Elizabeth, no English poet has selected the history of his own country as a subject for his successful muse ; the only exceptions being, we believe, some odes of Campbell's, and a few fine sea songs by others ; for we presume that no one will place the Campaign of Addison, Walter Scott's Field of Waterloo, or Henry Taylor's Edwin the Fair, in the category of poetical compositions.

In the second place, whereas, with few exceptions, all modern aspirants to dramatic fame have made a love story the *main-stream* of their plot, the author of Charles the First has so far deviated from the beaten track as to introduce nothing of the sort into his poem.

That others have lost and he has seized on a great advantage in the first of these matters will be readily granted—and the more that we consider the subject the more firm will be our conviction. It is indeed one amongst many of the causes of Greek excellence and the charms of Greek writing, that the literature of Greece was so eminently national, whilst at the same time it appealed to principles and emotions common to human nature at large. This gave a reality and a greatness to the works of Greek writers ; their own soul answered the touch like a ready string, and the sympathy of their countrymen answered like the vocal shell. Clearly, unhesitatingly, the sound went forth with no uncertain touch or artificial intonation—it was the voice of the soul in its power, and in its reality ; and it has thrilled and will thrill on wherever hearts shall beat or bosoms bound to the noble, the beautiful, and the true.

In the second matter there will be more diversity of opinion—many a sentimentalist will be persuaded that a far finer poem would have been produced had the author painted Cromwell, Strafford, Hampden, and Charles, as all desperately and criminally in love with the same fair one. Had he represented the Puritans as led on by their leaders to demand Strafford's life from amatory motives, and the king held back from pure generosity of nature as being unwilling to murder his rival, Hampden might then have been put out of the way by his associate on an opposite ground ; the discovery of the matter by Mrs. Cromwell and the queen might lead to disastrous results, and in fine, after the king's death, the relenting fair one might slay herself in the presence of his murderer, and fill the triumphant Protector with remorse and despair.

Such a play would no doubt have won for its author an instan-

taneous and world-wide popularity—the more enthusiastic from its utter irreconcilableness with truth or common sense. Loud would have been the applause of “*the prowling critic band*,” intense and overpowering the shouts of the rejoicing multitude repeating and re-echoing the plaudits of the Athenæum and its emulous contemporaries; bright eyes would have filled to overflowing with tears of admiration, and young hearts throbbed with generous sympathy, whilst witlings of all classes would have exerted their utmost energies to reproduce under various forms the unique, the transcendent, the miraculous *chef d'œuvre* of him whom the universal voice proclaimed as the greatest poet of the age!

Our opinion however on this subject is decidedly with the old writers and against the new. Love is not the only passion which animates mankind, nor the main spring of all actions public and private, nor the prime cause of every event, nor the undercurrent of every stream, nor the visible or invisible reality pervading, and permeating, and directing all the concerns of earth. And consequently to represent it in such a light is equally at variance with truth and therefore with taste, as to exclude it altogether from the field of fiction. Such was the practice of the ancients, such too has been the practice of many of the greatest of the moderns; we need cite but one witness—sufficient to decide our cause—for that witness is SHAKESPEARE!

But to proceed, we have no intention of giving an analysis of this fine poem, and shall content ourselves with a few extracts—though as in the case of any other real *drama*—the poem should be read *entire* to be appreciated.

The first act opens with the universal demand for Strafford's death. Hyde has been endeavouring to work upon Hampden's better feelings. Before he has time to reply, cries from both the Commons within the House and the people without are heard. Then the consistent patriot answers:—

“Mark yon cries.

Be they mine answer! If you seek to save
The crown of England, strive to bend your master
To just compliance with our England's weal.
Deem me not stern! I judge the king well-meaning,
Kindly in spirit, ill-advised. For me,
I had as lief control the waves of ocean
And calm them at my will, as rule these billows
Of popular emotion. It is said,
And must be done. Earl Strafford dies. I pray thee
Think me not deaf to thy keen arguments.
Had I free choice, perchance, the loyal zeal

Which yet is mine might tempt me—to injustice?
 No, scarcely that! And Strafford I believe
 Most guilty. Howsoe'er this be, I hold
 The king is not as any private man.
 He represents the vast executive:
 He moves while we do counsel. Thus the act
 Of Strafford's death will not be his, though his;
 He signs as king, not man. He hath no choice,
 Since parliament with voice unanimous
 Now urges—See, some friends of yours approach.
 Pardon me! I will leave you to their greetings,
 And enter now the House.

“*[Lord Falkland and Sydney Godolphin have issued from the House, Hampden exchanges bows with them as he passes and enters.]*”

“PEOPLE *[who recognize Hampden entering]*.”

Hail, worthy Hampden,
 Bulwark of Judah's strength! A tower of refuge!
 The voice of holy truth! Hail, Hampden, hail!

HYDE *[to Falkland and Godolphin]*.
 There passes of all honest hypocrites,
 All plain, straight, truthful, most unguileful liars,
 The very worst and first.

GODOLPHIN. How say you, Hyde?
 Hampden? The English Hampden? Oh, you err!
 Why, liberality may sure command.

HYDE. Name not the word, Godolphin, in mine ears,
 Its hollow echo maddens me!

FALKLAND. What, Hyde!
 The gentle, courteous Hyde, thus ire-bestraught?
 Ah, you are angered by poor Hampden's firmness.
 Be *that* his vice then, if you will! But now
 The other matter. Pym hath spoken erst,
 So speaking still. We seek you.

HYDE. And for what?

FALKLAND. To hear him.

GODOLPHIN. Oh, his eloquence to-day
 Seems more than human. To our ranks he turned
 To where we sat, we clingers to the king:
 ‘Gentlemen,’ spake he, ‘would you save your monarch,
 Awake you now to all the hour's demands.
 The people are in arms. Both Peers and Commons,
 Back'd with all England's voice, speak Strafford guilty:
 The king stands in the gap. For God's sake then,
 Avert the coming danger. Trust us, gentlemen:
 We know that you, as we, desire true freedom,
 Abhor vile tyranny: we nothing doubt

You are prepared (whate'er your former course
While doubt still rested *might* be), now that Strafford
Is thus deemed guilty, you are all prepared,
I say, to swell our cries for justice. England
Speaks now through me: in Freedom's name she calls ye
To act as her true sons: persuade the king
That this must be! Good friends'——

HYDE. Enough! enough!
Prate not this rebel cant.

FALKLAND. Oh this is prejudice
Indeed: not reason, Hyde. Godolphin speaks
The truth, and St. John too——

HYDE. Ay, he?

FALKLAND. He owns
The king must be persuaded; morally
Constrained.

HYDE. The traitor? owns?

GODOLPHIN. Come, Hyde, go back
With us. Hear Pym!

HYDE. For what? To prove a traitor too?
Do you then think some sounding words of his——
Oh Falkland, oh Godolphin, that my faith
Should prove reproach to you, that I should now
Be powerless to maintain the cause of right,
Without condemning your desertion!

FALKLAND. Hyde,
Desertion?

HYDE. And *what* then can be such deeds?
Such thoughts? You know Earl Strafford guiltless, know——

GODOLPHIN. We thought so. But who is not fallible?
Since England speaks, and Freedom——

HYDE. Come, despair!
All's lost. The very best and noblest, those
Who longest stemmed the tide, now borne away
Sink down the deep abyss, still down——still down——
And ne'er perchance shall rise again. Godolphin,
My heart is all too full for words; that thou,
That Falkland here, whom I believed my friend,
His king's true friend——that he should fall thus blindly!
Oh friends! Can I not give ye back yourselves?
You know, you still must know, however Strafford
May in light things have erred, that he is guiltless,
As you or I or any other man,
Of treason. *Can a thousand voices change
What is not to what is?*"——pp. 6—12.

The italics are ours. After an earnest discussion, in which Falkland and Godolphin advocate *concession*, Hyde answers in a

masterly and true-hearted speech—which we commend to the attention of all cowards and temporizers.

“ Ay, when the sole defenders of the state
Crumble away as ye do, then concession—
Concession? True: the plea of honest fraud,
Of most infantine truthful guile is this
Of Hampden and of St. John. ‘*But concede:*’
All will be well! You would secure the mansion:
Hurl then aside some few foundation-stones
To steady all the rest! ‘Tis like that they
Who ask such samples of your olden bulwarks
Will rest content with these; ay, very like!
Concession to a wrong against man’s conscience
Is tantamount to fall! Here lies the right,
And there the wrong: take once the downward path,
Abandon once this vantage-ground of justice,
On grounds of what men call *expedient*; then
Is no return: all’s lost.—I do perceive
I speak in vain. The poison of the age,
The spurious, vain, delusive liberality
Which tramples upon right, and in the name
Of freedom, doth usurp tyrannic sway,
This hath infected you. I scarce can hold ye
My heart’s true friends henceforth.”—p. 15.

This is as able as it is noble, as artistic as it is energetic, as intensely dramatic as it is essentially sublime. We know no writer, we are acquainted with no poem, in which such a passage would not command admiration. We have ranked Charles the First with the Medea; but passages such as these, and it is not the only one, would not have dishonoured either Sophocles, or Schiller, or Shakespeare himself.

The scene which follows soon after between Charles and Henrietta is exquisitely touching—the base and cowardly selfishness of the artful woman attempting to hide itself under the garb of anxiety for her husband, and stimulated to its vile purpose by personal dislike of Strafford—is exquisitely contrasted with the gentle, noble, confiding, loving heart of the king. Those who have the gift of tears will scarcely restrain them when reading this most pathetic interview. On the one side is all that can make woman omnipotent when she least deserves to be so; on the other, all that can raise our keenest enthusiasm and kindle our warmest sympathy for the husband, the father, the man, the friend, the patriot, and the king. It is just exactly one of those passages which prove and illustrate the highest dramatic excellence. Every word is just what it should be and where it should be to produce

the desired effect ; and yet we feel that we could not alter, or substitute, or transpose, without offending nature and truth. The poet does not seem so much as to have selected and arranged his materials to the best advantage, as to have been absolutely constrained to select and arrange them thus.

The dialogue is broken in upon by the arrival of Lord Keeper Littleton, St. John, the Archbishop of York, &c. come to urge the king to yield. The base-hearted Metropolitan says :—

“ Your public conscience
As monarch, Sire, constrains the very actions
Your private will might shrink from. For, alas !
There is no question, whether you should save
Or should not save Earl Strafford : only this
Remains to learn ; if you will perish with him !
The conscience of a king to save his kingdom,
The conscience of a father for his children,
Will all o’erweigh the conscience of a friend.”—p. 41.

We will not pause to examine the probability of the suppositions which Mr. Gurney has ingeniously suggested, and artistically adopted, with the view of lessening Charles’s guilt, in giving up his faithful servant Strafford to their common enemies. In our opinion nothing could, or can justify, or even palliate such an act ; what are usually called palliations, are merely the absence of aggravating circumstances. As a matter of policy, too, such a course was suicidal ; it was like the old story of giving up the watchdogs, to conciliate the affections of the wolves towards the sheep, the course now advocated by certain of the Tractarians, who are anxious for a coalition with the Church party, and think that it might be easily effected if only a *very* few men were got rid of. The day that sees that coalition dooms the Church of England ; the hour in which the Anglican party take any terms from their Tractarian opponents, but absolute and unconditional submission, devotes them to humiliation, degradation, and well-merited contempt.

But to return to our author. The Second Act contains the ill-advised attempt of the king upon the five members. The unbending righteousness of Hyde—the truckling servility and double-dealing vileness of St. John—the pitiable weakness of the king’s friends, and the strength and determination of his enemies—are represented to the very life. The characters of the various Puritan leaders are portrayed with a boldness of outline and nicety of touch, that remind one of Homer’s heroes ; and the fierce struggle is relieved by the tenderness of domestic affection.

In the Third Act matters reach their climax. Amidst the conflict of passions and the jarring of events, the great design moves imperceptibly, yet surely onward; whilst the characters of Charles and Cromwell prepare themselves more and more for their later development. But here the king commits another deadly sin, and, urged by the demands of his rebellious subjects, the prayers of his dastardly counsellors, and the entreaties of his wife, surrenders the temporal rights of the Church. There is much which is noble and beautiful in this Act, but we must pass it by without further comment.

The Fourth Act, which is as it ought to be—the beginning of the end, is occupied with the battle of Naseby. It is, in a descriptive point of view, quite equal to the Field of Flodden, in *Marmion*, whilst its dramatic power is of the highest order.

We will endeavour to give some idea of it by extracts. Let us begin at the beginning.

“ACT IV.

“SCENE I. 1645, June.

“*Royal camp on the heights near Harborough. The scene represents the interior of the King's tent. The curtains are drawn aside in the background, so as to afford a general view of the royal encampments, and the distant hills and moors. It is seven in the morning.*

“HORSEMAN'S DRINKING SONG [*heard from the distance*].

“Care, care, go hang, go hang!
Fate life's cords may sever;
Still we'll sing, as first we sang,
When joy's clarions loudest rang,
The king for ever!

“Death, death, come buss, come buss!
'Twere a vain endeavour,
Should'st thou hope to trouble us;
Come, we greet thee, shouting thus,
The king for ever!

“Life, life, beyond the grave,
We will fear thee never!
We are bold as we are brave,
Loyalty our souls should save—
The king for ever!

“KING CHARLES, *who has issued from the interior compartment of his tent on the right, approaches the background, and listens to the concluding verse of this song. He reclines his head mournfully, and appears to pray.*

"YOUNG CAVALIER'S SONG [*heard from the distance*].

I.

"My lady she rose in the dawning so clear,
And bent from her casement to love's Cavalier:
Go, fight for thy king and thy country, she said,
The banner of glory above thee be spread,
And angels hold guard o'er my Cavalier's head!
Yes, he sighed, king and country lay claim to my sword,
But love is my ruler, and love my reward.

II.

"They met, too, below. Could she frown on his prayer,
When he sped o'er the hills rebel Roundheads to dare?
No, many a sigh did she breathe for his fate,
And call'd on Heaven's kindness to shield him from hate:
Then blamed her sweet tenderness—dear one too late!
For the kisses, which trembled with passionate fear,
Were sweeter than prayers to the young Cavalier!

"KING CHARLES [*letting fall the curtains in the background, after a pause*].

"Light songs and drunken revels! Little thought
On the great hazard of this day—on God—
Or on God's judgments. May I hope for conquest
Whilst my best friends do so unworthy prove them
Of Heaven's high guard? Alas! my *noblest* friends
Have past from earth—as Heaven had ta'en them hence
To spare them future horrors, ills too great
For even them to remedy. Carnarvon,
Brave Lindsay, Aubigny—even more than these,
My Cornish worthies, Slanning and Trevanion,
With their most loyal leader, faithful gentleman,
Whose dear loss caused me tears I proudly shed,
My own Sir Bevil Glanvil! Add to these
Young noble Grandison; Godolphin, too,
Who proved he loved his king; and then, thou Falkland!
Who by thy stainless loyalty redeemed
Thine early weakness. All have pass'd away!
And left me, in the west, a lawless Goring,
Licentious, impious, worse than twenty foes,
Though brave; another Glanvil, how unlike
To his undying namesake! Best of all,
Thee, valorous, truthful Hopton, for whose life
I should thank Providence! Yes, thou liv'st still.
And here, too, I have friends. Yet how,
How close my eyes to the unwelcome truth,
That licence stains the best of these? Not Astley,

Not Lichfield—these are faithful to their God
 As me ; but for my nephew Rupert, and
 His friends,—alas, that I should have such cause
 To blame them ! Can I e'er forget, good Heaven,
 The recent storm of Leicester—my, my Leicester !
 (For am I not its king ?) wherein my subjects
 By Rupert's horsemen first, and then by others,
 Seduced through their example were, or slaughtered,
 Or pillaged at the least. With friends like these,
 Should I even hope for victory ? Who's to check
 The insulting rapine of such loyalists
 Triumphant ? Rupert even could not stay them,
 Once bent on vengeance. Then, too, if I turn
 To our foes' ranks, I find rebellion there,
 'Tis true ; but yet a seeming piety. Religion,
 Even misdirected, proves some check. O, King
 Of kings, and Lord of lords, if thou foreseest
 In thine eternal wisdom, that my triumph
 Will not secure thy Church from fall, nor save
 This state from rapine ;—and men's minds are yet
 So all-distorted from their bent, I fear
 In any case such ills ;—then reach, O Lord,
 Thine end, even by my fall—my death !—if that
 Seem good to thee. Perchance, remorse will work
 Even in my foemen's hearts, what bare defeat
 Could never.—Steps are nigh !"—pp. 166—170.

Then follows an interesting and most important council, in which the cool wisdom of Hyde is overborne by the rash impetuosity of Rupert. This is succeeded by two masterly interviews, developing that power of intense pathos which this writer has always at command ; the one between the king and a Puritan captive, whose wife and child had been murdered at Leicester ; the other between the monarch and Sir John Cansfield, offering him his third and last surviving son. We need scarcely say that the poet has brought out in powerful relief all the nobleness and tenderness of his hero's character. The scene closes with the departure of the Royalists to battle.

We must give the second scene in extenso :—

" Interior of Cromwell's tent in the rebel camp.

" CROMWELL alone. He is seated at a table in the foreground, and apparently lost in thought. After a pause he speaks.

*" The hour is nigh of vengeful retribution !
 This day a crown is won or lost by thee,
 Charles Stewart ! More hast thou to lose, perchance,
 Than I to gain ; for I—Hence, selfish visions !*

I am God's champion. England's cause is mine :
 'Save England, and then perish Cromwell!'—Speaks
 The Spirit thus? Not so: for that low voice,
 Within me breathing ever, what is this,
 If not the Spirit's voice?—The Fiend's?—Hence, hence
 Suggestion hell-born!—No; should Heaven thus will,
 Thus destine me for sway, am I not far
 More fit to rule an empire than this weak,
 Poor Charles? My conscience answers, 'Yea, I am so!'
 But *one thing* doubt I not; whate'er my fortune,
 Be my sway ruled above, or no, this king
 Must die the death! Yes, yes, dissemble not
 Thy purpose with thyself; elected Cromwell!
 Elected for this work! though it may fit thee
 To veil, in God's good cause, thy just designs
 From common eyes. Who now, I may say boldly,
 Who now can hope to check my will? avert
 My settled purport?—Hollis?—Powerless is he
 Against one word of mine; and Vane and St. John,
 They think them mighty, but their lord am I,
 As they shall find ere long; for Fairfax here,
 And Ireton, they are parts of me, nor dare
 To think without me. Two, who might have dared
 Oppose me, are no more—John Pym, and Hampden.
 For Pym, he was not girded to the work
 Of vengeance; false remorse oppress'd his spirit;
 He died the death of those who leave the plough
 Ere half the field be furrow'd. But thou, Hampden,
 Thou hadst, perchance, subdued me; for thy guile
 Was matchless. Well, thou art gone, and now I fear
 No rival, save this king, this Stewart! Charles Stewart,
 Thou art a mighty foe, I own it,
 Even in thy weakness. I am feared by men,
 But thou art loved! Thou steal'st their hearts away
 By thy faint smiles, and in adversity
 Might'st yet subdue a nation. Thou must die,
 Charles Stewart!

"Enter IRETON, FAIRFAX, and SKIPPON.

FAIRFAX. General, good morrow.

CROMWELL [*starting and rising.*] In
 The name of God be welcome, friends! What bring you?

IRETON. Tidings that Rupert for attack prepares.

SKIPPON. These lost Philistines leave their heights.

CROMWELL. How say ye?

On to the conflict then! The Lord of Hosts
 Shall lead us. Skippon, go thou forth—already
 Our troops await the signal.

SKIPPON.

It is so.

CROMWELL. See thou with Doiley, that their hearts be bold,
Their carnal man accoutred for the onset.

Forthwith I draw yon veil aside [*pointing to the curtain in the
background*] and speak

To all the host.

[*Exit SKIPPON.*]

FAIRFAX [*to CROMWELL*]. Whispers the Spirit to thee
The issue of this day.

CROMWELL [*solemnly*]. Upon the mountains
I saw their legions scattered, and the ensign
Of the One Lord Jehovah waved on high
Victorious! Ay, my heart assures me, Fairfax,
The war finds end this day: and then, then, Fairfax,
The kingdom of the saints is stablished:
Then, Ireton, shall the great Redeemer reign
Of Israel—then the bright Millennium dawn.
No more!—We combat for the Lord of Hosts
This day: his grace is on us. Ireton, cast
Aside yon curtains!

[IRETON obeys. *The rebel host is descried drawn up in
order on the plains.*]

Fare ye well, blest brethren,
In the good work! Each to your post, I pray you;
Whilst I to these my chosen followers here
Some words of godly comfort breathe. Ere long
Shall we rejoice together. [FAIRFAX and IRETON retire.

CROMWELL [*standing at the entrance to his tent, his face
turned towards the army*]. Praise the Lord
For Israel's avenging! Hear, ye kings! ye princes,
Tremble! Thou goest forth before thy people,
O gracious God! Iniquity prevailed,
Until thy servants rose to wage thy battles.
They chose new gods—the tyrants of the land!
Was there a heart to feel, an arm to smite,
Amidst our Israel's thousands? Ye awaked,
Ye chosen of the Lord, awaked from bondage.
The princes fought against ye, now they fight!
With ye the angels war from heaven; the stars
Fight against Charles, your Sisera! The rivers
Shall sweep them far away. The Lord hath said,
Curse ye this Meroz! curse ye all the foes
To God and to his saints! Set onward then:
This day the mighty work shall be completed,
Blow ye the trumpets. Cry ye as of old,
The sword of the Most High, and Gideon!
The hour of his redeemed is come!

THE ARMY [*tumultuously*]. The sword

Of God and of his servant, righteous Cromwell!
Set onward to the fight!

CROMWELL. The Lord of Hosts
Is with us! Smite, subdue, consume, destroy!"

pp. 187—192.

This is first-rate. The character of Cromwell is nobly imagined and finely executed. He is not the Cromwell of loyal bigotry or puritan enthusiasm; he is not Guizot's Cromwell, or Carlyle's Cromwell, nay, nor even *Gurney's* Cromwell, but *Cromwell himself*. How true to nature is that undoubting conviction, that awful consciousness, that he is the appointed instrument of God's providence, a persuasion, an assurance which may exist in all the fulness of undoubting, unhesitating faith, when all beside is doubt and darkness; a prophetic intuition which ensures its own fulfilment, and which has more than once animated those, who, endued with powers that might have made them the benefactors of mankind, have become ministers of vengeance, and felt themselves even in their crimes to be like Attila—*The Scourge of God!*

But our paper warns us that it is time to conclude, ere our author enters on the last act of his hero's career, and accompanies him to that fearful hour, when, having cast away one by one the sins which beset his earlier path, and being perfected through sufferings, he earned a more glorious, a more enduring crown, than earth could give or take, even that of the CHURCH'S ROYAL MARTYR.

ART. V.—*Observations on the past and present State of Fire-arms, and on the Probable Effects in War of the New Musket: with a Proposition for re-organizing the Royal Regiment of Artillery, by a Subdivision into Battalions in each special Arm of Garrison, Field, and Horse Artillery; with Suggestions for promoting its Efficiency. By COLONEL CHESNEY, D.C.L., F.R.S., and Royal Artillery. London: Longman and Co. 1852.*

It may be doubted whether a long continuance of the blessing of peace, such as England has now enjoyed for nearly forty years, be *politically* desirable for a country, unless her rulers are at the same time endued with sufficient wisdom and foresight to prepare for the possible contingency of a change of circumstances. We cannot undervalue the great advantages, social, commercial, and financial, which a nation enjoys during a period of peace: they are, in fact, inestimable. It is the time for the development of all that makes a country substantially great, as well as for the growth of all that is beautiful in art, or elevated in intellectual power. But have *we* derived these advantages from the long period of peace which has elapsed since 1814? Have *we* benefited by the blessings which Heaven placed within our reach? We do not attempt to enter upon the question of our finances, though we believe that these might be included in the same category with the others; but, we may ask, have our social and commercial positions improved? Have we risen as a nation among foreign powers? Have the internal prosperity and happiness of our people increased? Would that we could answer one of these questions in the affirmative! If we have not,—if our population is less contented and happy, our commercial relations less satisfactory, than formerly,—if, as we fear, England has fallen in the scale of nations, and, for the sake of preserving peace at any price, has more than once yielded, as in the boundary question in America and the ridiculous affair in Greece, in a way no government in former days would have dared to have done,—what have our rulers effected for us in other ways? They have not developed the peaceful resources of the country. Have they prepared her to unfold (when necessary) her warlike energies?

We hold that never was a greater political truth advanced than that to “maintain peace we must be prepared for war;” and it would not surely be unreasonable to expect that during nearly

forty years of tranquillity such judicious measures should have been taken for our security at home, and for the maintenance of our friendly relations abroad, as would have placed us above all apprehension or danger of a surprise from war. Yet if the public press and the literature of the day be any indications of the state of the country, we are, or believe ourselves to be, in danger from foreign aggression, and find ourselves by no means so prepared, as to be happy or comfortable at the prospect!

We have been repeatedly assured, and have brought up our children in the belief, that war is an evil which we look back to as belonging to barbarous times, that the reign of peace has commenced on earth, and that armies are a remnant of feudal oppression, to be got rid of as soon as practicable. A small fleet is all that England requires for her security. Negotiations will in future adjust all differences between nations, and fraternization will become general. With our peace orators, peace societies, peace excursions, we have so cherished and humoured this favourite vision of peace, that, like a spoiled child, it has turned restive, and, to the utter consternation of all, threatens to desert us in our greatest need. Yes, there can be no doubt about it, England is defenceless and alarmed; and, if such a terrible eventuality as war should arise, and the invasion of this country be attempted, bitterly shall we regret the infatuation and weakness of our rulers in yielding to a popular cry, notwithstanding the many warnings with which, more perhaps than at any other period of our history, we have been visited during the last few years. True, the leader of the great Anti-Corn Law League has advocated the transformation of our swords, not into *ploughshares* exactly (since he has almost rendered these superfluous implements in this country), but into steam-engines, or any other engines for the purpose of extending manufactures and commerce, and ensuring the permanency of their attendant, peace; true, the sturdy labourers from whom our army drew its brave recruits *have diminished* under his influence, and have joined the crowded populations of the manufacturing towns, greedy of gain, and eager to devour the pernicious doctrines of Socialist orators and Socialist publications; but have our rulers mistaken these unhealthy indications for the voices of truth and reason? Have they forgotten also that unless a body of men whose business it is to defend their country be kept up, the peaceful vocations and means of subsistence of a large portion of the population must be disturbed, if not paralyzed, to meet any danger that may arise at great expense to the state, and, after all, to meet it inefficiently? But let us take a retrospective glance at the events of the last few years, and see if the prospect of permanent peace has been interrupted till now.

In 1840, the accidental explosion of a magazine at Acre alone saved us from a serious war, the consequences of which would in all probability have been disastrous, for our fleet was far inferior to that of the French, our coast undefended by steamers, and our army much below theirs in strength. A few years later the affair of Tahiti had all but lighted the flames of war between England and her powerful neighbour. We know that the invasion of this country was seriously proposed to Louis Philippe, though happily rejected by that sagacious and peace-loving monarch; and that the President of the French Republic was only dissuaded in 1848 from his contemplated hostile descent on our coast by the not usually too peaceable M. Thiers, who said, (in reply to Louis Napoleon's proposition that "a great enterprise abroad, or some great popular creation at home, would captivate the passions of the masses, and attach them to the Government")—

"A great enterprise abroad is war; and to engage in war would be to repeat—and to repeat without any regard to what has already occurred, and in circumstances one hundred times less excusable—the great fault of the imperial policy. What, in fact, was the great evil which the imperial policy caused to France at the time that it covered her with glory? It was to unite Europe against her for a period of thirty years. An operation of nature is now going on, excellent in its effect for us, and which is gradually tending to dissolve that coalition. If you intervene by arms, you will be the means of re-establishing it on the instant, and the benefits which would result to France from that work of dissolution you would sacrifice in a moment. It is, consequently, peace which is necessary: peace for France, and, we may say, peace for humanity; since, by interrupting that work of nature of which I speak, and those movements of liberty, you would force them into an extreme demagogical career, which would of necessity be followed before long by an absolute government. Therefore, for the true policy of France, and for humanity, let there be peace!"

What were the fearful revolutions which convulsed and shook Europe to its centre after the French outbreak in 1848, but the strongest admonitions to England to be prepared for any emergency? Why was the warning voice of even the Duke of Wellington raised, if there was no danger? Still all till now has been in vain. The belief in the continuance of peace remained unshaken; and the noble spectacle which attracted the attention of the whole world to our capital in 1851, and drew crowds of admiring foreigners to our shores, seemed to the fond imaginations of these believers in their own theories the realization of their millennial dreams, the commencement of the reign of peace on earth. But suddenly startling events and changes have oc-

curred on the Continent. The acts of a powerful and more than efficiently armed nation have become dependent on the single will of an ambitious and unscrupulous man, and we are at length reluctantly roused from our state of fancied security and real self-satisfaction, and awake to find invasion possible, and perhaps an enemy levying a contribution on our capital!

This state of things has naturally led to a sudden increase of military literary productions. Shoals of "Letters," "Pamphlets," and "Suggestions" on "National Defence" and "New Rifles" have issued from the press, and among them our attention has been attracted to "a small book on a great subject," by the enterprising author of the "Euphrates Expedition," which, although appearing at this moment of *defence*-excitement, bears marks of having been written in calm and sober times. It is, in fact, an enlarged edition of a pamphlet on the re-organization of the Royal Regiment of Artillery, published by Colonel Chesney in 1849.

Although acknowledging the importance, particularly at this juncture, of a practical scientific work, such as the "Observations on Fire-arms, &c.," we non-military readers would far rather have found this officer again before the public in the continuation of his more elaborate and valuable work on the Euphrates Expedition. For several months we have been anxiously looking for the promised completion of this book, and were prepared to give the sequel of our notice (of Sept. 1850) on the early volumes; when Col. Chesney suddenly comes before us armed *cap-à-pié*, and so bristling all over with guns, new rifles, and needle-igniting muskets, that we are almost afraid to come near him! We certainly did propose that he should "clear the way" for us down the Euphrates "with swivel-guns, wall-pieces, and Congreve rockets," if necessary; but we never expected this gallant officer to have taken our hint so seriously as to proceed at once to indite a whole volume on these warlike subjects! Seriously, however, we do feel that at this moment, when the growing importance of the Euphrates line of route is increased by the state of public affairs,—when we see more than ever the vast consequence to this country of the command of a route through Mesopotamia, and acknowledge the desirability of a twofold means of communication with our Indian possessions,—it is much to be regretted that the public is not placed in a position to judge of the practicability of this line, by having the whole results of the Expedition laid before it. If the information we have received be correct, the failure by the Government of the promised funds for the publication in question is the sole cause of this lengthened delay. Other nations, however, will not remain insensible as England appears to be to the importance of this route. Russia is

fully alive to its value ; and we should not be surprised any day to see an effective exploratory expedition sent out to the Euphrates by our active continental neighbours, as has been suggested by the great orientalist, M. Etienne Quatremère, in his notice on Col. Chesney's work in the "*Journal des Savants*" (Juin, 1851).

Having thus vented our feelings of disappointment on the non-appearance of the continuation on the Euphrates Expedition, we return from this digression to the immediate subject of our notice. The object of these "*Observations*" is not merely to rouse the country to a consideration of its unprotected state in case of such a contingency as invasion, but more especially to point out the present inefficient state of the British Artillery service, and to throw out such suggestions for its re-organization as would infuse life and vigour into a torpid worn-out body. This Colonel Chesney proposes to effect at a very trifling increase of expense over the present estimates. His views and opinions are clearly and ably expressed, and their practicability shown in the details and calculations given in the schedules which form the appendix to his book.

Unless the importance of artillery be denied altogether—and even the warmest advocates of the various rifle-improvements will scarcely go so far as this—all that tends to render this arm more efficient must serve the cause of humanity in war, and of science in peace. Experience, and the opinions of the greatest captains of the age, point to artillery as the means of deciding most quickly and with the least possible sacrifice of life the struggles of contending nations ; while the very nature of this service secures the existence at all times of a highly-educated scientific body of men fitted for any enterprise the nation may be called on to undertake, and the tendency of which must be to raise the tone of the army at large. We need not remind the public that both this and its sister corps, the engineers, are officered by men scientifically educated, who form indeed the nucleus of all that is distinguished in intellect in our army. The importance of its being kept up in an efficient state is therefore palpable.

Colonel Chesney's principal propositions appear to be :—

1. An increase to the artillery proportionate to the rest of the army, such as will raise this force to the standard existing in all the continental armies.

2. A change in the system of promotion, with a view of placing, in high and responsible positions, younger and more efficient officers.

3. The adoption of the battalion instead of the company system, with permanent field batteries.

4. The separation of the regiment into garrison, field, and horse artillery. And

5. The removal of the military department of the Ordnance to the Horse Guards.

With this sketch of the objects of the book, we shall endeavour to give such extracts as will enable the reader to form his own estimate of the merits of Colonel Chesney's work.

The opening chapter is devoted to the importance of study in the art of war, and the advantages of theory in warfare even without practice, and the examples of Puységur, Turenne, Clerk of Eldin, the French Directory, and others, are appropriately cited in support of this proposition. The practical portion of the work is preceded by an historical sketch of artillery from the earliest times, which, though somewhat too compendious, contains much of interest, and is, as far as we know, the only approach to a consecutive history of artillery which has yet been attempted by any British officer. The name of artillery appears originally to have been "*arcualia*," from "*arcus*," a bow, and to have included all kinds of missiles. Froissart speaks of *two tons of artillery* at Yprès in the fourteenth century, chiefly arrows; and it was not till the invention of gunpowder that this name was restricted to what we now look upon as ordnance,—cannon, mortars, howitzers, and rockets. There seems to be little doubt that the knowledge of artillery was originally derived from the East, whether from China or India appears to be a disputed point: in both those countries the ingredients of gunpowder are found in abundance. The Arabs also lay claim to this discovery; but Colonel Chesney is of opinion, and we think justly, that their knowledge was derived from the Chinese, possibly as far back as the ninth century of our era, when commercial intercourse was carried on between Arabia and China through the Persian Gulf, and by means of the land expeditions of the former people in search of conquest. At all events the Chinese have been acquainted with gunpowder from the very earliest period, and, according to Sir George Staunton, it has been applied "at all times by this ingenious people to useful purposes, such as blasting rocks and removing great obstructions, and to purposes of amusement in making a vast variety of fireworks." It is uncertain when they first applied this invention to cannon, but these appear to have been in use as early as 614 B.C., when Colonel Chesney mentions, on the authority of M. de Paravey, the existence of a cannon bearing this inscription: "I hurl death to the traitor and extermination to the rebel." There are traces of the use of jinjals in the defence of the great wall of China, which was finished about 221 B.C.¹

¹ Embassy to China, by Sir George Staunton. Bulmer and Co., London, 1778, vol. ii. p. 198.

On the authority of the Spanish captain, Diego Ufano, we have evidence of the existence and use of cannon A.D. 85; while Duhalde, after describing the missionaries as having taught the Chinese the art of casting guns about A.D. 1636, says,—

“There were, however, three or four bombards at the gates of Nankin, ancient enough to make one judge that they had some knowledge of artillery; and yet they seemed ignorant of its use, for they serve for nothing but to be shown as curiosities; they have also pattering in their buildings on the sea-coast, but have not skill enough to make use of them¹.”

This clear contradiction of his own assertion, and Anquetil's account of “the existence of seven ancient bells at Peking, each weighing 620,000 lbs.,” Colonel Chesney justly thinks “are sufficient proofs that the Chinese have long been in possession of the art of founding.”

Evidence of the early knowledge of artillery in India then follows, the result of much painstaking research, and in which our author has collected many curious facts. We can only notice a very few of these.

“It is alleged that if Alexander the Great had even succeeded in passing the Hyphasis, he never could have mastered the strongholds of the sages. For, says the historian, if an enemy were to make war upon them, he would be driven off by means of tempests and thunders, as if sent down from heaven. Such was the case when they were attacked by the Egyptian Hercules and Bacchus, on which occasions the sages remained, as it were unconcerned spectators, till an assault was attempted, when it was repulsed by whirlwinds and thunders, hurling destruction on the invaders².”

It does not however follow that the lightnings and thunders of the Indian philosophers were caused by the explosive force of gunpowder, since we are also told iron horses with the figure of a man, also in iron, and placed on carriages, and filled with naphtha, were suggested to Alexander by the Indian philosophers as a means of repelling the 2000 elephants brought against him by Fúr, and which occasioned the greatest terror to the Macedonian troops. The explosion of 1000 of these machines destroyed and burnt many of Fúr's elephants, and spread devastation through his army; but was probably only an ingenious application of one of the many inflammable substances with which the Indians were acquainted. The early knowledge of gunpowder may however be inferred from the following curious passage in the Gentoo laws as given by Halked:—“The magistrate shall not make war with any

¹ P. Duhalde's *History of China*, vol. ii. pp. 78, 79. J. Watts, London, 1741.

² Philostrati. *Vit. Apollon.* lib. ii. cap. xxxiii.

deceitful machine, or with poisoned weapons, or with cannon and guns, or any kind of fire-arms;" and the early medical works of the Hindús contain clear evidence that they were acquainted with the constituents of gunpowder. About A.D. 1200, during the Ghorian dynasty, the Hindú bard Chused speaks of the loud reports of the calivers and cannon, and the noise of the ball propelled by them; while Múhammed Shah Bahmiani, A.D. 1368, captured 300 gun-carriages, which do not appear to have been looked upon as a novel invention even at that remote period. But we must pass over much curious corroborative evidence in favour of the eastern origin of gunpowder and artillery, merely touching upon some of the most striking facts. It was found by the Portuguese, on their arrival in the East in 1498 and in 1500, that Zamori's Nagres were armed with *matchlocks* as well as ordnance. Two years later Zamori's fleet was armed with no less than 180 guns, at which period the use of a clumsy description of artillery had scarcely become general in Europe. We read of "3000 guns brought to bear by the King of Java out of 8000 which he had at command;" and, which is still more remarkable, we find from De Barros that the fusil or musket was in use at Malacca at this period; whereas this weapon first came into play in Europe at the battle of Pavia in 1524. The passage is worth extracting:—

"As soon as the junk had passed the sand-bank and had come to an anchor a short way from the bridge, the Moorish artillery began firing at her. Some guns discharged leaden balls at intervals, which passed through both sides of the vessel, doing much execution among the crew. In the heat of the action Antonio d'Abreu (the commander) was struck on the cheek from a fusil (*espingardão*), carrying off the greater number of his teeth."

Artillery was also in use at Malacca, in Borneo, and in various parts of India at this period, though of a very clumsy description. Large heavy guns, constructed of bars of welded iron, and loading at the breach, appear to have been the most common. We agree with Colonel Chesney in thinking it probable that "gunpowder was introduced through the means of the Saracens into Europe." The Arabs were evidently acquainted with its use, and the Moors availed themselves of this knowledge in quite the early part of the twelfth century. From this period it gradually, but apparently very slowly, made its way to other parts of Europe. It is not till early in the thirteenth century that we read of the "crakeys of war" of Edward III., and the ten cannon of the Chevalier Cardaillac at Cambray. A few years later we find cannon spoken of as "invented" at Bruges by a tinman of that city, who con-

structed an iron gun with a square bore, and cubical iron shot weighing eleven pounds; but because it killed a man after passing through the wall of the town, the experiment was not repeated, and the terrified inventor took refuge in the sanctuary of the church until his innocence of doing any intentional injury had been proved! A pretty strong proof that the good burghers of Bruges were unacquainted with gunpowder and cannon up to this period. Colonel Chesney throws some doubts on the use of artillery at Cressy, the authority of Villani, on which this assertion rests, being unsupported by Froissart or any other chroniclers of those times, although they enumerate Edward's forces with considerable detail. He considers that artillery was in use for sieges at this period, but was not introduced for field-guns till later; and certainly we find no mention of this arm at Poitiers, while Froissart does speak of *espringals* and *bombards* as used by Edward at the siege of Calais, one year after the battle of Cressy, and cannons and bombards at the siege of the castle of Romozantin immediately after that of Poitiers.

The progress of artillery in Europe was very slow until towards the close of the fifteenth century, when it first became formidable under Charles VIII. of France, who not only organized an effective field force, which he restricted to six different calibres, but had his guns so well horsed that he has by some been considered as the father of the horse artillery. We are reluctantly obliged to pass over Colonel Chesney's interesting and graphic descriptions of the various kinds of ancient guns still in existence at Venice, Verona, in the Musée de l'Artillerie at Paris, and the Repository at Woolwich. Some of the most singular of these are *the cannons of boiled leather* used by Gustavus Adolphus, and which mainly contributed to his victory near Leipzig in 1631. They were so light that two men could draw and serve them, and from the rapidity with which they could be moved, they were far more efficient than would have been supposed from their calibre, and the necessarily small charge employed.

The introduction of musketry and other small arms in the beginning of the seventeenth century, formed another important epoch in the annals of European warfare. The three great leaders of that period, Henry IV. of France, Maurice of Nassau, and Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, turned their attention especially to the improvement of their artillery; and the brilliant successes of the latter over Tilly and Wallenstein, were mainly attributable to the superiority of his guns over the heavy unmanageable pieces of the Imperialists. We cannot pass without a word of commendation Colonel Chesney's animated account of the Battle of Leipzig, and passage of the Lech; but our wish to

give some extracts from the practical part of the work prevents us from dwelling any longer on its historical portion.

Under the head of "the Present State of Continental and British Artillery," we have the comparative strength of the Prussian, Austrian, Russian, French, and British artillery services. The immense importance of this arm in deciding the fate of engagements, is demonstrated by our author in an animated review of Napoleon's principal battles. We have Marengo, with its one hundred pieces of cannon, Austerlitz, Jena, and Friedland. Bonaparte's last successful attack at Wagram was made under a demonstration of fifty guns in one part, and 110 guns in another, while at Borodino upwards of 1100 cannon were brought into action,

"Napoleon's army numbering 133,000 men, with 590 guns, that of the Emperor of Russia 132,000 men, with 640 guns, being one piece for 225 in the former, and for 206 men in the latter case."

At Lutzen, the passage of the Elbe, Bautzen, and Leipzig, the same decisive results attended the use of an overwhelming force of artillery. In the latter struggle,

"200 pieces of artillery preceded the advance of the allied army, and later in the day 1000 were brought into action." "The allies numbered 280,000 men, with about 1370 guns, in this gigantic battle; and the French had 166,000 men, with 720 guns, being one gun in proportion to 203 men for each army. The French, in this prodigious struggle for empire, are said to have discharged 230,000 rounds." "In 1833, Prussia had 27,000 artillerymen, with 864 guns, or 1080 including the landwehr, and the proportion of guns taken into the field by the allied Russian and Prussian armies varied from between 1 for 159 men at Lutzen to 1 for 203 men at Leipzig; the latter being also the proportion of the French in the same battles." . . . "When the British army assumed the offensive on the evening of the 18th of June, 100 pieces of cannon crowned the heights of Waterloo, and covered the advance. But in this memorable conflict, when the proportion of artillery was so much greater than it had previously been in our service, there were but 156 British guns to contend against 246 French; or, for those who were actually engaged, only one gun for about 408 men, whilst during the Peninsular war the proportion was considerably less; thus in the action of Vimeira (18 guns and 16,000 men) there was 1 gun to 889 men, at Corunna (12 guns and 14,000 men) one gun to 1166 men."

On taking a general average, we find there was one gun to 785 men throughout the Peninsular campaign. It was in vain that the Duke of Wellington complained of,

"the equipment of ordnance being infinitely lower than that of any army now acting in Europe,"

we were as deficient in artillery then as we are now, when we are told that we have

“only fifty-two guns horsed for service in Great Britain, viz. five troops of horse artillery, and eight batteries at Woolwich and elsewhere. Whereas if the number were to be based on that of the continental armies, for instance, on the Prussian corps of 40,000 men assembled on the Meuse in 1815 with 200 pieces of cannon, there would be 178, or, according to the limited allowance of the Sub-Committee of Artillery, 87 guns for the 35,612 regular troops in Great Britain, without providing any whatever for an additional force, or, failing this, for the militia and volunteers.”

It is painful to read these and the following details, and to be obliged to acknowledge how much is wanting to place this country in any thing like an efficient state of defence. We emphatically coincide with Colonel Chesney,

“that it is worthy of attentive consideration whether it be not absolutely necessary that there should be an augmentation of artillery both at home and abroad, for garrison and field service.”

Our colonies can scarcely be said to be defended at all.

“Gibraltar, for instance,” he states, “has 653 guns mounted, for which the five companies of artillery stationed in that fortress could not furnish quite one man for each gun. At Malta, there are 486 guns mounted with three companies of artillery, or two men to three guns. In the Ionian Islands, 351 guns with three companies, less than one man to each gun. In America, the West Indies, and our other colonies, there are 1928 garrison guns, with (after deducting those in the batteries) twenty-eight companies to man them, or not quite two men to each gun.”

Let us add to this 9100 miles of seaboard in Great Britain and Ireland, for the defence of which we have only 1523 guns, which, few as they are, would have only three gunners to man each piece, and we shall have a tolerable idea of the deficient state of our artillery service.

We do not propose to enter at any length upon the much agitated question of invasion, since the fact of the possible danger is admitted on all sides. But we cannot read the Duke of Wellington's famous letter to Sir John Burgoyne in 1848, we cannot open General Paixhans' “*Constitution Militaire de la France*,” or see such a publication as Baron Maurice's pamphlet on “*National Defence in England*,” without being aware that our unprotected, exposed condition has been made the subject of

discussion and speculation among foreign nations, and that they are much more thoroughly acquainted with our assailable and weak points than we are ourselves. They have nothing more to learn—we have much, not only to learn, but to *do*, if we would avoid the possible disgrace and misery of having a foreign enemy on our shores. To quote Lord Palmerston's words in the recent debate on the Militia bill:—

“Our insular position, which constitutes our strength in one respect, is a source of weakness in another. A continental power is defended by certain roads, and it knows from what points to expect a blow, and how these points can be defended; but the vast circumference of this island necessarily prevents the concentration of force. It is impossible to say when and where we may be attacked. The channel may be passed in a few hours; and a few days might bring a considerable military power from more distant countries. I believe the navy is most efficient; but it is perfectly impossible for any navy, however active, vigilant, and numerous, to prevent an armed force from being landed upon these shores. Considering the short interval of time in which it could be effected—considering the distance of the various points from each other—with the knowledge also that an expedition might land in Ireland, I think it is evident that we should have a land force to resist armed men. There are no fortifications like brave men armed to meet an enemy. The more you are prepared the less probable an invasion will be. In proportion as you are prepared the danger will be lessened.”

We were told by Lord John Russell, that he thinks “it never can be assumed that a country in the position in which this country is can be secure from the danger of war;” that “since the invention of steam navigation this country can no longer be considered so safe as it was formerly considered, when it was necessary to be favoured with wind and weather in order to carry out an invasion;” and his proposition, therefore, was to “make permanent provision for the defence of the country in case of invasion,” by enrolling 70,000 militia, 30,000 of whom would be trained the first and 30,000 the following year. This force might eventually be raised to 150,000 militia, including the volunteer force. Now we may be permitted to ask, could such a force of imperfectly trained, partially disciplined men, however brave and devoted to the cause in which they might be engaged, be considered a “permanent provision for the defence of the country?” We should say decidedly not, when we remember that they would be opposed to well-disciplined experienced troops; and we would earnestly call upon the Government to weigh this question well⁴.

⁴ We have spoken here of the militia, as proposed by Lord John Russell,

But admitting them to be efficient and capable of contending with regular troops, where is the artillery necessary to support them? What number of guns can we bring into the field to accompany our militia and repel the invaders? We have already been told that we have fifty-two guns horsed, and these, be it observed, are only horsed on the peace establishment. Does it not therefore appear that an increase of artillery, as suggested by Colonel Chesney, is absolutely necessary?—the more so that irregular troops require the support of artillery even more urgently than a well-disciplined force, although it has been satisfactorily shown that even the best troops cannot act without it. According to the very low estimate of the Artillery Committee of three guns to every thousand men, 356 guns would be required to accompany 150,000 militia-men. “To horse such a number,” observes Colonel Chesney, “in order to provide against a possible contingency is scarcely to be thought of, more especially as in case of emergency, large assistance in point of untrained animals would be at command.” But it must be remembered that “untrained” gunners would be worse than useless, and that *eighteen months’ instruction and drill are requisite to make an efficient artilleryman*. No augmentation to this force can therefore be raised *on an emergency*; and again repeating, that if we would preserve peace we must be prepared for war, we pass on to the consideration of the best means of rendering our artillery service, whatever may be its strength, as efficient as possible.

Notwithstanding our progress in other respects, it appears from Colonel Chesney that the proportion of artillery to the other arms taken into the field of late years has been diminished rather than increased, which we might have expected would have been the case, when the saving of life by the judicious use of a powerful artillery has been universally acknowledged. In Flanders in 1742 and in Germany in 1762 we had rather a larger proportion in the field than during the Peninsular war, when the Duke of Wellington complained that “it was infinitely lower than that of any army acting in Europe of the strength of the British part of the allied army alone, and below the scale he had ever heard of for an army of such numbers.”

One of the principal defects of our artillery service at present appears to be the slowness of promotion, in consequence of which the officers are usually worn out and unfit for service before they

although these words were scarcely written before he had resigned office, and left the responsibility of carrying out this measure to others. But, as far as any thing can yet be known of the policy of the present Government, they merely intend to follow their predecessors’ proposition of calling out the militia, considering this a sufficient provision for the present exigencies of the country.

reach the upper ranks. Colonel Chesney tells us that the senior lieutenant-colonels do not attain this grade until they are from fifty-six to fifty-nine years of age, while they are between sixty-three and sixty-six before they reach the rank of Colonel. As he justly observes,

“They then no longer possess the necessary physical strength to make a fair return to their country for the pay and allowances which they continue to draw ;” and he adds, “such a state of things is calculated to destroy hope, as well as every thing like ardour ; and must, therefore, if not remedied, eventually compromise the remaining efficiency of the corps.”

It appears also from the following passages, that in a scientific corps, requiring all the encouragement the State can give, the officers of artillery hold a lower place in the British service than these officers do in any of the continental armies.

“In the continental armies the artillery officer occupies a higher place, not only in point of pay, but also in rank and consideration generally. In Russia the senior officer of a battery has a higher rank than that of captain ; viz. a captain of artillery has the rank of lieutenant-colonel, which, as a matter of course, improves the position of his juniors, and every subaltern enjoys a step beyond his regimental grade.”

“In France the officers of this arm speedily attain the rank of captain, even in time of peace ; and they have, besides, the powerful encouragement of one step in three being given, by selection, for merit, the two others being awarded by seniority, with, as has been shown, ample opening for higher employment.”

“In Austria, Prussia, and Sweden, the artillery officer is distinguished in proportion to his scientific attainments ; and he is, in consequence, more frequently advanced than the officers of the other two arms.”

“But in Great Britain alone the first captain is behind all his contemporaries, not even excepting the officers of marines ; and he is excluded from the general staff of the army, on whom are conferred the commands at home and abroad.” . . .

And, again, in elucidation of the question of the general employment of artillery officers we extract the following :—

“In addition to the extensive staff belonging to this branch of the service, so large a share of general employment falls to the artillery officer in France as to cause the envy of their contemporaries of the line. With reference to the undue favour supposed to be bestowed on this service since the time of Napoleon, General Prinal published a voluminous pamphlet, in which he broadly states that officers of the line are

alone fit to command a corps d'armée, from which he would exclude those of the artillery, who should be confined exclusively to their own service. In consequence of the view so strongly taken by certain generals of infantry and cavalry, a report prevailed that it was intended to confine officers of artillery and engineers to their own specific duties; but the following reply appears to have set the question at rest:—
 'C'est en effet une étrange prétention que celle qui consiste à soutenir qu'un officier d'artillerie, qui a du nécessairement faire des études plus approfondies que les autres, dont on exige beaucoup plus de connaissances, &c., est par cela même inférieur aux autres: rien assurément ne justifie une pareille assertion; et je passe au fait qu'indépendamment des ses connaissances, en général beaucoup plus variées, un officier d'artillerie est infiniment mieux au courant des services des autres armes que les officiers de cavalerie et d'infanterie ne le sont de ce qui concerne l'artillerie.'

It is not surprising that in following a system so opposite to that adopted by all other nations, and so disadvantageous to the artillery corps, this service should have become a prey to the defects which we now proceed to notice.

In the first rank of these we find the crying evil of the extreme slowness of promotion, with the consequent lengthened periods of service of the colonels and lieutenant-colonels, who have not even the advantage of the temporary promotion which would be the result of *seconding* the twenty-five artillery officers, whose employments, whether civil or military, exempt them for the time from regimental duty. In this respect the artillery is at least five years behind its sister corps, the engineers, and *very* considerably behind the Madras engineers, partly owing to the greater number seconded in these corps, while the unfortunately large proportion of company to field officers in the artillery service, necessarily leaves but few outlets for officers of the higher ranks; Colonel Chesney says only six, two colonels and four lieutenant-colonels out of the fifty company officers of a battalion. This serious evil, we are glad to see, he proposes to remedy without expense, either by retirements, judiciously made, or by a total reconstruction of the regiment. The basis of this change is the formation of smaller companies, with three officers to each. Colonel Chesney supposes four of the existing companies to form a battalion of six smaller ones, to which he allots a colonel, two lieutenant-colonels, an adjutant, and quartermaster, making, with the eighteen company officers, twenty-four in all to a battalion, and 452 non-commissioned officers and men in peace time, or 600 in war; the companies in the latter case being augmented from 72 to 100 non-commissioned officers and men. This clear and simple suggestion, the advantages of which

are too evident to need any comment, would do away with the useless ranks of second captain and second lieutenant, and thus give a

“more suitable proportion of the superior to the junior officers, and at the same time put an end to the system of doing duty by separate companies and different field officers.”

On this point, Colonel Chesney says:—

“It will be admitted that a division of an army, consisting of regiments known to one another, by having been previously brigaded together, would be more efficient when in the presence of an enemy, than another division, which might be equally good, but which is formed of regiments brought together for the first time, as was the case in Holland during the expedition of 1793, and again in 1799, when the regiments forming brigades, and the generals commanding the latter, were unknown to each other.

“For the same reason, if the choice companies belonging to as many distinguished regiments were assembled under different field officers, they would, for a time, form an imperfect corps; and yet this system prevails in the artillery. . . . For example, at one of our most important foreign stations (Gibraltar) there are five companies, namely, No. 8 of the 2nd battalion, No. 3 of the 3rd, No. 4 of the 7th, No. 7 of the 7th, and No. 7 of the 9th, under a colonel and lieutenant-colonel of the 2nd.”

It is palpable, that an army or regiment under several heads could not work efficiently, all *esprit de corps* must be destroyed, and all unanimity at an end; or, as Colonel Chesney expresses it, “it is well known that one large machine works better, and at less expense, than several smaller ones giving the same power.” Battalions, therefore, of six companies, which would possess the advantage of having one officer responsible for the efficiency of each, would at the same time enjoy uniformity of drill and duties, and the advantages arising from mutual knowledge of each other among the officers and men; advantages belonging, by the by, to every regiment in our army, instead of the present desultory duties of the artillery, where the officers are constantly moved from one company or battalion to another, and can feel comparatively but little interest or pride in the section to which for a time they belong.

Colonel Chesney's attention has not, however, been confined to the disadvantages weighing upon the officers of his corps; he equally advocates due rewards and encouragements to the deserving non-commissioned officers and men, and seems disposed to recommend, in addition to civil appointments, a return to the

system discontinued of late years, of giving occasional commissions to those raised from the ranks. While agreeing with our author, that "due encouragement," and we would add education, to the soldier, are of the greatest importance to the welfare of a country both in peace and war, we would yet recommend much more strongly than he has done, the appointments of the field-train, as far more suitable and judicious prizes to deserving non-commissioned officers, than commissions. The latter scarcely seem to be compatible with the conditions on which alone commissions should be given in a *scientific corps*, and it is doubtful whether the individuals in question are in every case really benefited, by being removed from a class in which they are looked upon as little kings, and placed among others from whom they are estranged by habit, education, association, and feelings. Whereas, as quarter-masters, master gunners, or, still more, as storekeepers, &c. &c., these men would be most efficient and really in their element. There are innumerable situations of this description belonging to the civil department of the Ordnance, which in all foreign services are filled by old soldiers; but in ours alone are reserved for patronage and jobbing.

As to the relative merits of horse and field-artillery, we do not attempt to enter upon the much-discussed question, because it is now generally admitted that both are essentially requisite to the efficiency of an army. There may be differences of opinion as to the proportion which each should bear to the other, but there can, we conceive, be none as to the necessity of keeping up both these branches. All that is wanting is to make the field-artillery as perfect in its line, as the horse-brigade is already; for, to use Colonel Chesney's words, "our horse-artillery is, but our field-batteries are not what they are capable of, and might be made."

To effect this, it would be necessary that our field-batteries should be made permanent; indeed, there is every reason why this should be the case; and this, naturally, brings us to a consideration of the separation of the service into field and garrison-artillery. It stands to reason, that people must be most perfect in the duties they are accustomed to; and to attempt to make every man an efficient infantry and cavalry soldier, in addition to all that is required to form a gunner, in the short space of eighteen months, seems a positive absurdity. An artilleryman is, perhaps, ten months in battery at Woolwich, and is then sent to some foreign garrison, where he never mounts a horse, or is reminded in any way of his battery duties for years. If suddenly called into the field, how can this man be expected to be efficient in his duties? Whereas—but we had better quote Colonel Chesney's own words here:—

“ At present we endeavour, and with a certain degree of success, to make every company fit for all kinds of duty, and the artilleryman becomes, in consequence, at once a cavalry and an infantry soldier ; a grenadier, at one time, by his size ; and at another, from his activity, a light-infantry man. On being dismissed from the marching and small-arm drill, he enters upon that of his own particular service, comprising the duties required both in the field and in garrison ; stable duties are included in the former, and the uses of all sorts of military machines constitute part of the latter. All are necessary for the complete instruction of the artillery soldier ; but it is manifest, that the efficient performance of such varied duties requires a separate distribution, or, at least, a subdivision into heavy and light artillery.

“ Men who are perfectly suited for the latter service, appear to require the youth, strength, and activity of light-cavalry ; and if such men were selected for field-duties, they might with advantage, as they become more advanced in life and less active in body, be transferred to the garrison artillery, in which they would, for several years, be fully equal to the duties, either at home, for example, at Portsmouth, Devonport, Guernsey, Jersey, &c., or at such places abroad as Gibraltar, Malta, &c. As to the officers, the slowness of promotion has, unfortunately, left too many who are unfit for active duties ; therefore, if enough can be found for the field-batteries, there will be more than sufficient for the other branch.”

Again—

“ The duties of the colonial and field-artillery are so different, that it is an object of paramount importance for the well-being of the service, that the two branches should be separately organized : the latter should comprise horse-artillery, as well as field-batteries ; and, as part of both, there should be a regular pontoon-train.”

Upon this subject, Colonel Chesney says :—

“ The want of practical knowledge in the management of such equipments is dwelt upon by Sir Robert Gardiner, in his pamphlet ; and the letters published in the ‘ Morning Chronicle,’ by Major-general Sir Charles Pasley, who had much to do with the pontoon service, show its defective state in the earlier part of the Peninsular campaigns, and also that much still remained to be done at their termination.

“ ‘ Early in 1812,’ says Sir Charles, ‘ Lieutenant Piper, of the Royal Engineers, was placed in charge of a train of pontoons, recently sent from England, which was drawn by oxen supplied by the commissariat. It was guarded by Portuguese infantry, and the only pontooneers were a few English artificers to keep the pontoons in repair, and a party of Portuguese seamen. With these means, however, a pontoon-bridge was placed over the Guadiana, by which 12,000 men passed the river on the 16th of March, 1812, to besiege Badajoz.’ ”

“ ‘ Early in 1813, larger pontoons from England were substituted for the smaller ones first used, and formed into two divisions of eighteen pontoons each ; one under the same officer, and the other under Captain English, of the Royal Engineers. The Portuguese seamen were now increased to 100 men, under a lieutenant and two midshipmen from that service ; and horses, under Lieutenants Wilford and Matthison, of the Royal Artillery, drivers, were substituted for the oxen. The Duke of Wellington being obliged to postpone his attack on the French army, in consequence of the delay that occurred in throwing a bridge over the Garonne, in April, 1814, and perceiving that the state of the horses had much to do with the impediments, Captain Green, of the Royal Artillery, was ordered to take charge of the drivers and horses, the scientific duty being still entrusted to the engineer officers¹.’

“ But as hostilities terminated within a fortnight of the change here alluded to, it is obvious that the pontoon-train was only in process of organization ; and it is equally clear, that up to 1815, this desirable object had not been accomplished ; for the Duke of Wellington appears to have contemplated the employment of a distinguished post-captain of the navy (Sir Charles Napier), and 200 seamen ; but on finding that some of the sappers and miners had already been trained to this duty, their services were declined ; and the whole department was then organized on an extensive scale, in the short space of two months ; but still, as it appears, with the disadvantage of having Flemish drivers.”

Again—

“ In France, the personnel and matériel for the construction of military bridges are extensive, and are fostered with extreme care, which, however great it may appear, is not more than is absolutely required to accomplish the objects on which the success, and even the safety of armies so frequently depends. This being the case, the pontoons have belonged to the artillery service since the beginning of the fifteenth century, and the permanent bridges to the engineers.”

Colonel Chesney, who appears to have had considerable practical experience of pontoons, gives the following summary of the objects to be accomplished by such an establishment ; they relate—

“ First, to the positions occupied by, and the principal communications of, an army, and comprehend the formation of the more substantial bridges, as those on piles and tressels, as well as those of boats, pontoons, casks, &c. Secondly, to those connected with its movements, more particularly with the operations of cavalry and light troops, and comprise the formation of frame or lever bridges, &c., stretched from side to side for wider streams ; also, for the same purpose, flying-

¹ Major-general Sir C. Pasley's letters from the “ Morning Chronicle,” 23rd June, and 5th July, 1849.

bridges of rafts and small pontoons, inflated skins, or prepared canvas cloth. These means, or a part of them, should be at hand, with the advance, so as to be always available."

It seems unaccountable, that the British army should be still without so important a part of its equipment as a pontoon-train, notwithstanding all that has been said and written on the subject of this deficiency. Amongst hundreds of instances of its extreme importance in war, Wagram may be mentioned, where it will be seen that without a perfect pontoon arrangement, the French army must have been sacrificed.

"The bridges across the Danube having been destroyed, that part of the French army which remained in the island of Lobau was separated from the main body; Napoleon had therefore no other resource than either defeat on the one hand, or to undertake, on the other, as the means of victory, one of the greatest and most difficult operations ever accomplished in war, viz. forcing a passage in the face of a powerful army, commanded by one whose talents and experience almost equalled his own."

Every thing turned upon the speedy exertions of the pontoniers, who did their parts so effectually, that some hours employed with energy enabled the celebrated Bertrand to say to his master, "Sire, il n'y a plus de Danube;" and there was still time, by a speedy passage and a prompt attack, to counteract that already begun by the Austrians on the left of the French.

Another subject treated of by Colonel Chesney, and one that must give rise to conflicting opinions, is the desirability of promotion by merit to a certain extent. Every body knows that however brilliant the services of an artillery or engineer officer may be, he cannot obtain any step out of regimental turn; the system of advancement by seniority is never departed from. On this subject, Colonel Chesney says:—

"The certainty of promotion in turn, whether the individual be well or ill qualified, has the disadvantage of taking away the strongest incentive to exertion, namely, the prospect of acquiring distinction. For this reason, exceptions should undoubtedly be made in favour of the somewhat rare instances of brilliant and distinguished service, and also professional qualifications and attainments of the very highest order. The bare possibility of promotion in this way, were it only bestowed on one out of each successive ten at the top of the list, must speedily change a state of hopeless apathy for one of continued emulation, not only in the pursuit of theoretical knowledge, but must also lead to this being followed up by animated exertions to excel in the ordinary practical duties of an officer."

One of the strongest arguments against this change is that it would open a door to favouritism to an unlimited and cruel extent, and that it would be impossible for those appointed to distribute the rewards, to judge of the respective merits of officers scattered all over the world; the deserving, but retiring man, would be passed over, while show and interest would carry all before it; and well-founded heartburnings and dissatisfaction would be its result. Men of high standing in the service, and of sound judgment, have held most adverse opinions on this subject. One of the highest authorities in the artillery service, the late Major-general Sir Alexander Dickson, was on the whole opposed to any change from the seniority system, though admitting "that he did not object to it in cases of any peculiar distinction." In such cases alone would it seem to be desirable, or to use the words of the Commissioners in 1832, in cases of "such pre-eminently distinguished services as should place the individual above all rules." Such instances would doubtless carry with them the suffrages of the whole corps, as would have been the case with such men as Sir Augustus Frazer and Sir Alexander Dickson. In reference to the latter, Colonel Chesney well says:—

"The modesty which ever accompanies real merit, and his affection for the artillery service, caused the latter officer to forget that his own case shows beyond all question the necessity of being able to depart occasionally from the strict rule of seniority. His rank in the Portuguese service enabled him to be placed in command of the allied artillery, although at that time only fortieth in the list of captains in our service, and had it not been for the former accidental circumstance, he must have been advanced out of turn, or the Duke of Wellington would have been deprived of one of his ablest supporters throughout the arduous campaigns in the Peninsula."

One more extract on a question of such exciting interest to the officers of the corps:—

"But perhaps the question may be best viewed as a choice between the evils of inertness on the one hand, and the incentive of bright and animated hopes on the other. The latter, it is true, would be attended with great and serious evils; but these, it is to be hoped, would be more than counterbalanced by considering the interests of the nation rather than those of individuals, a distinction which has been so happily expressed elsewhere. Alluding to the advisability, if not the absolute necessity of selecting general officers for promotion with a view to employment whilst in the prime of life, Earl Grey, on being asked by the Committee of the House of Commons whether any system of selection would not be invidious, and open to the charge of favouritism, replied,

‘ I think it would ; but I think that though this is an evil, it is a much lesser evil than that which now exists.’ ”

We think so too ; but here we leave this question of a choice of evils to say a word on one on which we scarcely think there can be two opinions ; viz. the late appointment of an instructor to superintend the studies of the second lieutenants after they leave the academy. There can be no doubt of the benefit conferred on the artillery by this step. It has often been remarked that even those who have distinguished themselves as cadets, have fallen off and disappointed the hopes they had raised, when freed as second lieutenants from all necessity of study. We cannot but agree, therefore, with Colonel Chesney in thinking that,

“ Were it established that second lieutenants are not to take permanent positions in the regiment till they leave the captain of instruction, every benefit that can be obtained by talent, assiduity, and competition would be the result, while a love for study and the habit of application must be the consequences.”

The work before us dwells strongly upon the disadvantages arising to the service of having so large a portion of the Queen’s troops serving in India without any of our artillery or engineers. This is, no doubt, one of the palpable causes of the backward state of promotion in the corps, and is also injurious to the East India artillery, which would benefit in common with our own artillery by coming in competition with their European brethren of the Queen’s service. The additional patronage arising to the East India Directors from this system appears to be the chief obstacle to the attainment of this boon for the corps.

Another change, and one which would probably be productive of highly beneficial results, would be the reduction of the existing number of ranks, by doing away with the grades of either lieutenant-colonel or colonel. It has long appeared to us that far too many ranks exist in our army. What do we want with generals, lieutenant-generals, major-generals, and brigadier-generals ? But without questioning the wisdom of retaining so many “ nice distinctions,” we cannot help remarking upon the absurdity of having two officers so nearly the same in rank as colonels and lieutenant-colonels, that the difference between them is scarcely to be discovered. We cannot conceive why both these ranks should be kept up, since they only serve to retard by ten or twelve years the attainment of the rank of major-general. That this is not a “ consummation devoutly to be wished ” is, we think, made clear in the following extract :—

“ As it is understood that the necessity has been both felt and

expressed by the highest military authorities in the country, that the grade of major-general should be obtained in the army at an earlier age than at present, some means will ere long be found to accomplish this object; and perhaps doing away with either the rank of colonel or lieutenant-colonel in the army might be one of the easiest means of accomplishing so desirable an end."

In recapitulating his proposed reconstruction of the regiment, our author states that this reorganization into smaller companies composing twenty-four battalions, or brigades of artillery, with twenty-four field and company officers, would only occasion an annual increase of 859*l.* 13*s.* 3*d.* over the present estimates. If the proposed changes be desirable, and we think them decidedly worthy of all consideration, there would therefore be no obstacle on the score of serious addition to our already large ordnance expenditure. The schedules which accompany this work, giving all the details connected with the expense and working of the proposed reconstruction, will enable those, whose province it is to attend to these matters, to judge of the practicability and probable effects of the reforms in question.

A chapter on the new muskets follows the artillery portion of this book, and the comparative excellencies of the breech-loading, Minié, and other rifles are gone into at some length. On the whole Colonel Chesney's predilections appear to be in favour of the Prussian Zündnadelgewehr; and the tables of experiments (which he gives) with the Norwegian and new Prussian rifles are of considerable interest. The great improvements which have recently taken place in fire-arms, and their adoption by continental nations, have, in connexion with the general feeling of apprehension existing at this moment, so forced the question upon the public, that we anticipate a full and fair investigation into the claims of these various weapons. We are therefore less anxious to notice this part of Colonel Chesney's book than that relating to the efficiency of our artillery, to which, after all, we must mainly look for defence should an enemy ever approach our shores. There is, however, no doubt that an improved musket must and will be adopted for our army, notwithstanding Sir Charles Napier's chivalrous defence of the present "Queen of Weapons." We cannot but be amused by this gallant veteran's condemnation of a rifle which "he has not seen," and his apparent alarm lest our troops should be deprived of their musket and bayonet and armed *en masse* with Minié rifles! Sir Charles can scarcely be so ignorant of all that has been proposed and written lately on this subject; and instead of our soldiers "losing confidence in their queen of weapons" because it is proposed to give them a musket having a truer aim, a longer range, and a

more destructive ball, we should have supposed that by putting them on a par with Minié or Needle-igniting-musket-armed troops, we were taking the only rational means of making them feel confidence in their weapons and in themselves. Few indeed of Sir Charles's brave fellows would live to cross their bayonets with the enemy if they were to be sent against him with their present inefficient muskets. We never heard till we read Sir Charles's pamphlet, that any one dreamt of depriving our soldiers of their bayonets. Some change of tactics would seem, however, to be the inevitable consequence of these improved fire-arms; and as they have been *already adopted* on the Continent, we have no alternative but to do the same, or disband our army altogether. To send men into the field with the certainty that they must be shot down before they could come to the charge with the bayonet would be too preposterous to be thought of. It does not, however, seem probable that the present system of tactics will be materially altered, *provided we keep pace with the improvements of other nations* in the art of war. Such, at least, seems to be Colonel Chesney's opinion. Artillery will still hold its place with reference to the decision of battles and to its moral effect; and although Colonel Chesney gives us the ideas of a Prussian officer, Captain Wittich, on the changes to be expected from the introduction of the new musket, we think he scarcely goes so far in his views of modification as the author he has quoted.

A striking change in the artillery armament is however proposed: viz. the substitution of one description of gun—a 12-pounder howitzer mounted on an 8-pounder carriage, and equally adapted for shot and shell—for the various calibres now in use. This idea, which originated with Louis Napoleon, has been subjected to extensive experiments at Metz, Strasbourg, Toulouse, and Vincennes, of which trials Colonel Chesney has given us the interesting and important results. If it be true that this 12-pounder howitzer unites the efficiency of our 12-pounder and 9-pounder guns with the advantage of the lightness of the latter, the sooner we bring it to the test of experience, with a view to its adoption, the better, since the advantages of such simplification cannot but be apparent. This suggestion, however, opens a large question, which we trust will meet with the consideration it deserves from our military authorities. We should have far more hope on this, as well as on all other points connected with military reorganization and improvement, if the several branches of the service were brought, as they ought to be, under one head. It is only when the artillery service becomes an integral part of the army, that we can hope to see its defects remedied, and its efficiency duly promoted. It is an undoubted

anomaly to have our engineers and artillery, when out of the kingdom, entirely under the officer in command of the troops, while at home they are quite independent of the Commander-in-Chief. The present system also causes a delay and complication of references, the evils of which can only be duly estimated by those who have suffered from them. Add to this the discouragement to engineer and artillery officers, of finding all staff and other employments, open to the line, closed to them, however well qualified they may be, with the still more serious evils to the service at large, which we shall find detailed in the following extract, the last we shall give, from the work before us:—

“ It may be asked, whether, if the Ordnance military corps had been equally subjected to the Commander-in-Chief, there would at this moment be 30,497 Queen’s troops serving in India, without any of her Majesty’s artillery at all? Also, whether such a palpable deficiency of artillery would have been for a moment permitted as that complained of by the Duke of Wellington, in his letter of the 27th February, 1813, from Frenada? Or that to which his Grace called the attention of the Government of the country, at a later period, in the following words?—

“ ‘ *Bruxelles, April 15, 1815.*

“ ‘ MY DEAR LORD,

“ ‘ I assure your Lordship that the demand which I have made of field-artillery is excessively small. The Prussian corps on the Meuse, of 40,000 men, has with it 200 pieces of cannon; and you will see, by references to Prince Hardenberg’s return of the Prussian army, that they take into the field nearly 80 batteries, manned by 10,000 artillery. These batteries are of 8 guns each; so that they will have about 600 pieces. They do not take this number for show or amusement. And, although it is impossible to grant my demand, I hope it will be admitted to be small.

“ ‘ Yours, &c.

“ ‘ WELLINGTON.’

“ ‘ To the EARL BATHURST.’

“ Indeed it may, on the contrary, be confidently affirmed that, if the artillery had been equally subject to the Commander-in-Chief, the great pains bestowed on the service by the Duke of York would have secured for the armies in question, as well as for every other field force, a due proportion of artillery. Nor is it going too far, to express a confident belief that, whenever the British force shall become essentially one army, it will, whether consisting of 50,000 or 150,000 men, have at all times that proportion of artillery which may be fixed upon as suitable for the wants of the country, abroad as well as at home.”

In reference to the preceding, it is well known that the Duke of York deeply lamented the unfortunate state of things which

precluded him from extending to the artillery service those benefits which he delighted to bestow on the army at large. Indeed we may well admit that some radical defect must exist, when, in order to expose the vices of the existing system, we see a high-minded officer driven to publish such painful personal details as those relating to Colonel Chesney's position at Hong Kong in the book before us. Until this crowning remedy for all defects shall have been brought into operation, it will be vain to look for that unity of purpose and that centralization which can alone ensure the efficiency of our army. We have now at the head of the Ordnance a nobleman capable, and we believe willing, to carry out all judicious reforms. If Lord Hardinge be ambitious of the highest of all distinctions, that derived from benefits conferred, he has now an opportunity of earning the gratitude of the whole corps, by using his powerful influence towards *merging the Master-general of the Ordnance in the Commander-in-Chief*. Night after night Messrs. Cobden, Bright, and Co., descant upon the inefficiency of our military services, notwithstanding the enormous outlay for their support. There is unfortunately but too much truth in what they assert; but if those in power would but take the initiative in reform, and enable us to point to an efficient army and artillery, as well as to a powerful navy, all cavillers would be silenced, and the security and respectability of our country secured. Let our army be as small as is considered safe for a great nation like this,—we are no advocates for overgrown military forces,—but let it be *efficient, justly proportioned in all its parts*, and animated by that spirit of unity and confidence in itself which are the characteristics of a vigorous, healthy body. If, as seems probable, England will henceforth rely in some measure upon her militia for internal defence, let it not be forgotten that provision must be made *beforehand* for a *due proportion of artillery* to act with this force whenever it may be called upon; and let all inventions for the improvement of our ordnance be fairly examined and tested while there is yet time. The French experiments with the 12-pounder howitzer have set us a practical example which we would fain see followed.

It is from our strong conviction of the importance of this subject to our existence as a nation that we have dwelt so largely upon it. The extracts we have given from Colonel Chesney's book will have enabled the reader to judge for himself, in some degree, of its merits; although, in a notice like the present, our object having been to seize upon and bring prominently forward those points most requiring public attention, we have necessarily omitted many important details and much interesting information both to the unprofessional and military reader. Colonel Chesney's

earnestness and anxiety for the welfare of his corps are apparent throughout the volume. His style is simple and straightforward, that of a man full of his subject, and impressed with its importance. He sometimes gives his readers credit for as great a knowledge of his subject as he possesses, and this has led to an occasional ambiguity and obscurity of diction, which would scarcely however strike a military man. But the volume on "Fire-arms," &c., is undoubtedly a valuable addition to our military literature, and we shall be happy to see it meet with the consideration and success which it deserves.

ART. VI.—*The Anglo-Catholic Theory.* By BONAMY PRICE, M.A. Reprinted from the "*Edinburgh Review*," No. CXCII., October, 1851. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1852. (12mo. pp. 85.)

WHEN opposite extremes are struggling for the mastery, those who are disposed to maintain a middle course must make up their minds to endure taunts and sarcasms without end. In religion and in politics it is pretty much the same tale: the moderate, sensible, practical, and humble-minded man, is sure to be charged with inconsistency, dishonesty, vacillation, and want of logical power, by those who imagine they can see a vast deal further than he can, and who assume to themselves the proud distinction of being the only consistent reasoners, and the only honest men in the community. It is undoubtedly somewhat tantalizing to these theorists, who lay down the law for all the rest of the world, to see men of intelligence, not wholly unqualified to judge in such matters, admitting or denying some first principle of theirs, and yet pretending to exercise so much independence of judgment as to withhold their assent from the inferences and conclusions which the aforesaid theorists declare and pronounce perfectly irrefragable; and even holding on the quiet tenor of their way, without paying much heed to the wranglings and taunts of those who would fain win them over to the profound systems in which they respectively rest their faith.

We have observed for some time what appears to be a systematic and organized attack, though a covert one, on the general principle of the Church of England; and it seems high time to take some notice of it, and to discuss in some little detail the positions taken by the various writers alluded to. We purpose, therefore, in the following paper, to speak of some of the leading objections to the Anglo-Catholic theory, as it is called. We do so, without in any degree identifying ourselves with every theory which receives that appellation: nor indeed do we employ that term to designate the general views for which we contend, because it has unfortunately become mixed up with notions of which we cannot approve, and, on the contrary, very decidedly disclaim. Our object in considering these objections is to point out the danger to truth, which we conceive to be involved in them—and the inconsistency which they present, with the evident and un-

deniable principles of Christianity, and the framework of our doctrine and discipline. We say it is high time to be on our guard, lest, under the guise of hostility to "Tractarianism," and to "High Church" principles, notions should be imperceptibly received, which would go to the subversion of faith, and promote the cause either of dissent or of Romanism.

We are glad that the appearance of Mr. Bonamy Price's Article in the "Edinburgh Review," and its subsequent republication, affords to us an opportunity of grappling with this subject, and bringing to the test of fair discussion, the class of arguments in which it deals, and which meet us in the Radical and Dissenting journals at every turn.

The ground which we defend is this in general—that there is a principle and position, which is calculated to maintain the authority of the Church without the excesses of Romish despotism, and yet in opposition to the spirit of anarchy and disorder—that this principle or position is the attribute of the Church of England, and that it is the principle of the Word of God. We trust that we are not about to maintain any new theories. We are thoroughly sick of "theories;" we have had far too much theorizing—irreverent and presumptuous theorizing on the most important subjects. We are not advocates of any ideal theory, but of the plain, obvious, notion of the Church of England, and of a Church in general.

There are many points in Mr. Bonamy Price's tract from which we are unable to withhold our assent. There is much truth in its statement of dangers which are evident to all but a very small portion of the community, and for which no effectual remedy has as yet been provided. Nor indeed is it easy to see how it is possible to provide, under any system, against evils such as those to which Mr. Price alludes. Persons who openly resist the authorities of a religious community, may be got rid of. Persons who so deny the doctrines of a Church, that they can be made responsible to the ordinary tribunals of that Church, may be censured or otherwise punished. But unless we establish Mob Law in spirituals, and introduce the "Lynch" system into the Church; or, on the other hand, establish an Inquisition, we really see no very evident means of forcibly terminating the spread of a spirit of disaffection. For the evil at present in the direction referred to is, that there is a want of attachment to the cause of truth—an inclination and prejudice in favour of error. How can this be forcibly dealt with? Men cannot be compelled to love the Church of God, any more than they can be compelled to love God Himself. Their scepticism cannot be healed by force in the one case, or in the other. We must confess our serious appre-

hensions as to the results of any legislative interference by Parliament—not so much from the offence which it might give to individuals or parties, or from any jealousy of the interference of the Temporal power in religious matters; because both Inspired and Ecclesiastical history show, that on many occasions, the Temporal power has interfered beneficially in religious matters, and protected the faith against innovations of a dangerous character. And as long as the Church of England refers us to the examples of the godly kings and rulers of the Old Testament, and of the Christian emperors under the New Testament; and as long as the Reformation itself, abounding as it did in acts of interference by the Temporal powers for the reform of Religion, is held defensible; so long must we recognize the abstract right of the Temporal power, under special circumstances of danger to the Faith, to interfere. Nor do we say that such special circumstances do not now exist; we are far from denying that they do exist. There is a great evil which all ordinary expedients fail to eradicate; there is so great a division, that it certainly may admit of a question, whether it could be suppressed even by a Synod, or whether that Synod would subdue or irritate existing evils. But, while recognizing this abstract right of the Temporal power to interfere in such circumstances as we are placed in, we should certainly feel great apprehensions, lest a Legislature constituted as ours is, should root up the “wheat” with the “tares,” and thus aggravate our evils, were it to attempt to remedy them. For ourselves, we remain of opinion, that under all the circumstances of the case, the Church will be best fenced in, and protected, by the assembling of a Convocation, which shall represent fairly and fully the Clergy and the Laity of the Church—giving the power of election to such Laity as are in full communion with the Church, or have evinced their value for the ordinances of religion by receiving the Holy Communion. None but intelligent and pious members of the Church ought to take any part in its management, and no other line can be drawn practically but that of communicants, and non-communicants. Such a body ought, according to precedent, to act in subordination to the Temporal power; and all we can say is, that if it did not act on this principle, while acting also on the dictates of conscience, it would not deserve to exist. We are convinced that the great mass of the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England are warmly and devotedly attached to the Established Religion, and that a Convocation fairly representing them, would do its duty well.

It will be seen, then, that we are far from being insensible to the existence of the evil, of which Mr. Price speaks in the following passages:—

“Do then, we ask, the events of the past year furnish us with any brighter hope for the future? We have indeed chased away some of the anxieties which pressed upon our imaginations. We have learned that the people of England are Protestant still. This is something: for there is always an advantage gained by dissipating an imaginary prestige of success. Not that this proof of our Protestantism will make the Church of Rome one whit the less persevering or less confident; but it may weaken the inclination so commonly felt to side with what is thought a rising cause. But if nothing more be done: if no progress is made in diminishing the religious and other influences which Rome brings to bear on the minds of men, the vehement protests of last autumn may be but the convulsions which precede death. Lord Shaftesbury indeed promised much. Amidst enthusiastic applause he gave a pledge, that, if the Tractarian treason were not rooted out by the bishops, the laity of England would take up the work in earnest, and obtain safety by an efficient Church reform. The Tractarian disloyalty remains, and Lord Shaftesbury makes no move. We are not bringing an accusation against Lord Shaftesbury. For though our difficulties might be partially removed by legislation, heavy indeed would be the responsibilities which would lie on a real Church-reformer. To attempt a reform worthy of the name would be to put the whole Church of England into the crucible: and for this, neither the statesmanship, nor the religious intelligence and feeling of the country, are yet prepared. In our judgment, therefore, Lord Shaftesbury acted more wisely in suspending than he would have done in fulfilling his pledge. Only let us distinctly recognize our real position,—that no bar has as yet been opposed to the advance of Popery, either within or without the Church.

“At the same time, it must be admitted that the Tractarian or Anglo-Catholic party has sustained a serious discouragement. The agitation of the public mind has decided the waverings of not a few important persons among the Tractarians. Whether it has been that their doubts had become ripe for resolution, or that the reproaches of Protestants have drawn their attention more forcibly to the ambiguity and untenableness of their position; whatever may have been the immediate cause, they have renounced the communion of the Church of England, and have been reconciled, as it is termed, to that of Rome. Two consequences have followed this act. In the first place, the eyes of many have been opened to the tendency and ultimate effects of Tractarian principles. But a second and a not less impressive result has ensued: the Tractarians have been made to feel distrust of themselves and their position. A party which loses its leaders by continual defections, just in proportion as they are distinguished by learning, ability, and earnestness, must have its confidence shaken, as to the soundness of its views and its power of sustaining them. What can be more damaging to a cause, than to be abandoned in almost unbroken succession by those who have fought at its head with the sincerest enthusiasm, and have enjoyed the best opportunities, and have pos-

sessed the greatest capacity, for appreciating its merits? A disquieting suspicion of the hollowness of their position has come over the most honest of the Anglo-Catholics: fresh secessions are taking place: and men of equal ability cannot be found to fill up the gaps which have been thus made. Who, among the foremost of the Anglo-Catholic school, except Dr. Pusey and a few of his immediate friends, if even these are to be excepted, can be now considered safe by the Anglo-Catholics themselves.

“ But we must not fall into the enormous blunder of inferring from the fact of a certain amount of disorganization having overtaken the Anglo-Catholic party, that the mischief has been destroyed at its root. The eminent men, who have left it for the Romish communion, possessed, if not greater sincerity, at least a clearer intellectual vision and a higher consistency of thinking, than the mass of their former associates. Their condemnation of the Church of England is evidently not acquiesced in by the main body of those whom they have abandoned. As a party, they must be startled and disturbed by the secession of their leaders; but it will not drive the majority of them from their opinions.”—pp. 5—9.

While we would not be understood as concurring in various points of the above passage, still we must admit that there is much sad truth in it. Mr. Price, however, does not see his way clearly to any practical solution of the difficulty, or removal of the danger. We, on the contrary, look to a fair representation of the Church of England as the ultimate practical remedy; and, in the mean time, we would say, that the heads of the Church have it in their power to contribute materially to the prevention of further evil, by exercising with firmness their power of refusing ordination, except where there is the most perfect evidence of *formed and settled opinions adverse to Rome*—and a sufficient pledge that there are no connexions of any kind with those who are unsettled or suspected. We feel assured that public opinion would bear out any bold and honest exercise of episcopal vigilance in this direction, or in reference to the licensing of curates. And we therefore feel, that there is a very *considerable* safeguard against the spread of unfaithfulness; and we must confess, that we think there is now quite as urgent a need of rigid investigation on such points in examination for orders, as there can be for inquiries into views on baptism; indeed, we will say the need is more urgent, because men who are indistinct or mistaken in some of their views of baptism do not, at least, forsake the Church of England, and carry their congregations along with them; but men of the other class *do* secede in numbers, and endeavour to disseminate their errors, and to gain converts for Rome. The one is not found practically to lead to dissent, while the other is found practically to lead to Romanism.

But while writers like Mr. Price, confess that they do not see their way to any practical measures for eradicating admitted evils, they imagine that the spread of what they consider to be sound and enlightened opinions, will be of some use in checking the spread of error. We entirely concur with them in this view, and we are prepared to go along with their argument to a certain extent. They are only stating the truth in maintaining that some views of the Church, and of its authority, naturally lead persons to Rome. But they mix up views which ought to be kept separate, and they exaggerate the logical coherency of the Romish system, i.e. they swallow all the Romanists say on this point: and they are mistaken in supposing that all and every kind of admission of Church authority must, if consistently carried out, lead to Rome—that strict reasoning finds only in the Romish system what it requires, as a logical and consistent claim of authority. They are equally mistaken, in imagining that there is no alternative between an absolutely infallible Church, and an unlimited exercise of private judgment; or a Church formed by the fortuitous combination of individual opinions and tastes, and dissolved, reformed, split, and re-united according to fancy. We think that such a view does a serious injustice to Christianity; it represents Christianity, in the first instance, as a question of logic; and it ends, by demonstrating that in neither extreme, which it recognizes as logical, is consistency or common sense to be found. It will be our effort to show this in the course of the following pages. We assert, that the choice which such reasoners as Mr. Price, and a good many other writers of the same kind, place before us, is injurious to Christianity.

Let us briefly examine the description which Mr. Price gives, of what he calls “Anglo-Catholicism.”

“What then is the Anglo-Catholic theory of the Church? It teaches that there is one Universal and Apostolic Church, an outward and visible society, whose essential characteristic is unity. Membership with this Church is the condition for obtaining the privileges of the Christian religion, of which the sacraments are the chief. These sacraments are possessed exclusively by the Church; and to it Christ has also given power and authority to declare the truth. Moreover, Christ has instituted in this Church a special corporation, perpetuating itself by the specific and inviolable law of succession from the Apostles through episcopal ordination and imposition of hands; and this order of men are first, priests, mediating between Christ and His people, with the right and power of sacrificing, dispensing the sacraments, absolving, and judging of doctrine; and, secondly, the sole legitimate rulers and governors of the Christian Church. Such are the main elements of the Anglo-Catholic theory. It holds much in common

with the Roman ; although it fails utterly in some of the essential requirements, which Rome early saw to be necessary for constituting a consistent and logical whole, and which with unscrupulous courage she has claimed and assumed in her doctrine of ecclesiastical polity.”—pp. 24, 25.

The system which is thus described, is represented by Mr. Price as held by Anglo-Catholics, and by Roman Catholics, with some differences, more especially in the point of infallibility. He then proceeds (pp. 26, 27) to argue, that if a Church government of this kind, making such exclusive claims, be regarded as essential, there is a positive obligation to produce an explicit, positive charter, conferring such rights on it—to show a clear and direct Apostolical command—“an explicit absolute title, derived either from the positive declarations of Christ and His Apostles, or else by *necessary* deduction from the very nature itself of the Christian religion.” He then proceeds in these terms :—

“The Romanists felt that the demand could not be evaded : but they also found it impossible to procure such a charter from Scripture upon the principles of the ordinary interpretation of language. They next appealed to the practice and belief of antiquity ; but neither did these bear out their claims with the distinctness and positiveness required. An endless amount of vague and obscure statements, and yet more the strongest diversity of opinions, presented themselves in the writings of ancient Christians. There still remained the vexatious necessity for producing an objective standard, a principle of selection : the definite and peremptory charter was still not forthcoming. The doctrine of Infallibility could alone fill up the gap in the argument, and supply what was needed ; and with true logical and practical instinct the Church of Rome boldly and unreservedly pronounced itself infallible. This infallibility furnishes the requisite rules for the unerring interpretation of Scripture and tradition ; and the interpretation thus determined is easily made to furnish every title-deed necessary for the Church. Private judgment and the freedom of individual thought are effectively got rid of. An infallible oracle silences diversity of interpretation : to differ is to rebel, and is met, not with argument and refutation, but with chastisement and expulsion.

“The logical unity of this theory is perfect : its issue with Protestantism simple and direct. Catholicism or Protestantism is established, according as the tremendous claim of infallibility is established or overthrown. In the assertion of that infallibility, however, the Romanist has firm, logical standing-ground. The Protestant treats Popery as a gross corruption of Christianity ; the Roman Catholic rebuts the charge by pleading supernatural revelation as the authority for his religion. The controversy thus ultimately turns on the evidence which can be produced for a fact ; and whilst the Protestant pronounces that fact to be most gratuitously assumed and to be utterly destitute of proof, the

Roman Catholic may still reply that to *his* understanding the evidence for it is satisfactory."—pp. 29—31.

Now we really must offer one or two remarks on this passage. Its object is to prove that Rome alone can consistently maintain the positive obligation of the Episcopal form of Church government, because she has claimed infallibility, and her infallibility completely settles the obligation of Episcopacy. Mr. Price has apparently forgotten, that in the Council of Trent the most violent disputes took place on the very point of the Divine institution of Episcopacy, and that those who wished to insert that doctrine in the Decrees of the Council were in a minority, so that the doctrine was actually not defined. Thus, in point of fact, the Romanist who maintains the Divine right of Bishops, occupies *precisely the same ground* as the Anglo-Catholic, and is obliged to prove his position from Scripture and tradition. It is all very well to talk of the convenience of assuming infallibility, but when Mr. Price speaks of "the logical unity of this theory" as "*perfect*," we really must demur. "Private judgment" in the matter of Church government, is *not* "got rid of" by the "infallible oracle" in this case. A Romanist may hold that the Pope could dispense with Bishops, or he may hold that Bishops are divinely instituted and essential to the Church; and "private judgment" is his only guide in either case.

We have a few more words to say on this "perfect logical theory" which Mr. Price so freely and so liberally ascribes to the Church of Rome. He seems to think that the necessity of producing any argument or proof for the theory of Church authority as held by Romanists, is dispensed with at once by their assumption of the doctrine of infallibility. Their Church vouches infallibly for the truth of its doctrines: it is of course needless to enter into any investigation of their proofs: all exercise of private judgment is at an end; the principle of authority is perfect. Now just let us view this "logical" system a little more closely: its object is to exclude altogether,—simply, wholly, and absolutely,—private judgment. Faith is to be built solely on an infallible authority. Now is it so in fact? From whom does the Roman Catholic learn his faith? From a priest or a bishop who is not himself infallible, and who has, in his turn, learnt this doctrine of his Church by the exercise of his private judgment on the interpretation of the formularies and decisions of that Church. The Roman-Catholic is thus placed in the same position as the Anglo-Catholic. He bases his belief on the teaching and decisions of his Church, just as the Anglo-Catholic does on what *he* considers of authority; but if he comes to inquire what that teaching and those decisions *are*, he is thrown at once on "private

judgment." The *Church* does not tell him infallibly *what* her judgments and decisions are. He has to look for them amongst the councils and the decrees of popes. He has to examine whether a council meets all the conditions of an oecumenical council. He has to translate, and to interpret the meaning of its decrees. He has to examine whether any particular papal decree has, or has not been universally received. He has to do all this by means of his own private judgment, or the private judgment of one or more others, for the *Church* does not tell him any of these things. And after all, how is he to be assured that the decrees of pontiffs, or the actions of synods, have come into his hands free from interpolations, and in their genuine and authentic shape? Who is to vouch for their right interpretation? In all these respects, that is to say, whenever he makes an act of faith in any one of the doctrines decided by his Church, he does so on the strength of "private judgment." And in fine, there is the great question of all, What proof is there for the doctrine of infallibility itself? Who can *infallibly* assure the Romanist that his Church is infallible? What is his course of argument here? He takes the Bible in his hands, and proves that the Church was to possess certain characteristics. He next shows that his Church alone meets those conditions and characteristics. Then he argues from Scripture and tradition that the true Church must necessarily be infallible. But this whole process is, after all, an exercise of *private judgment*. In these most difficult and important questions, he is not infallibly guided. His Church has never pronounced his chain of reasoning valid, or set the stamp of infallibility on the process. She has not even affirmed her own infallibility by any formal decision. If she does so in practice, she also asserts practically that Scripture and tradition are valueless, and incapable of demonstrating any doctrine until they have been guaranteed by her authority; therefore she excludes herself from the power of demonstrating her own infallibility from Scripture. She cannot do so without violating the well-known rules of reasoning, and arguing in a circle. Notwithstanding this, she does so without scruple, but in so doing she recognizes in each individual, *the very same* private judgment and inquiry that the Anglo-Catholic is obliged to employ. If the Roman Catholic, or any one else is supposed to be capable of satisfying himself of the Divine origin of Christianity; of the authenticity, genuineness, uncorrupted preservation, correct translation, and true meaning of the Holy Scriptures: if he is supposed capable of attaining certainty as to historical facts in ancient and modern times, and of determining the genuineness and meaning of the monuments of tradition; if he is enabled to do this with so much certainty by the

efforts of his private judgment, that he is supposed qualified to investigate and examine such knotty questions as the visibility, unity, sanctity, catholicity, and infallibility of the Church—why, in the name of reason and common sense, is he not equally capable of examining the question of transubstantiation?

We are really astonished at the course pursued by such writers as Mr. Bonamy Price, in reference to Rome. They invariably play into the hands of Romanists: they never dream of doubting the assertions of these ingenious men with reference to the logical coherence and beautiful consistency of the Romish system! They re-echo the boastings of the Jesuits. And for what reason? It would really seem that they had taken a leaf out of the Jesuit book. The Jesuit is ready to sacrifice the whole of Christianity and to yield it up to the infidel as an imposture, if it is not made to assume as its basis and first principle, the infallibility of Rome. Concede to him that principle, and he will allow Scripture to be authentic and inspired. Deny it, and he will meet you in the guise of an infidel. And, on the other hand, here are men like Mr. Price, who are willing to give up *every thing* to the advocates of infallibility, in order to embarrass those who will not consent to embrace their anarchical principles. If a man is not a latitudinarian and a democrat in religion, such writers as these would endeavour to subvert his religious principles altogether, and to hand him over to Romish bondage.

Mr. Price having lauded to the skies the beautiful consistency of the Romish theory, thus turns upon the Anglo-Catholic:—

“Far otherwise is it with the unfortunate Anglo-Catholic. The denial of infallibility puts him out of court. Many a wistful glance have Anglo-Catholics cast towards infallibility; and frequent have been their attempts to insinuate, for they dared not to affirm, the tenet. The Church of England rejects it. In her articles she proclaims the fact that the Church has erred. She affirms in this same charter of her creed, not only that Churches of the highest name; the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, have erred; but that even General Councils gathered together from all Christendom ‘have erred even in things pertaining unto God.’ Her separation from Rome, and the Anglo-Catholic’s un-Catholic isolation from almost all Episcopal Christendom, rest on the declaration that the Church has been fallible. Every where her foundation for truth is Scripture: she pleads Scripture as the ground of every doctrine she professes: her test of orthodoxy is an appeal to Scripture. Arguing from the ascertained fact of the actual admission of error, she makes Churches and General Councils alike amenable to the bar of Scripture: that is, she disowns the existence of any unerring organ of truth on earth. Every member of the Church of England, therefore, is debarred from the use of that argument without which the long array of the ablest controversialists which the world has

seen has found the proof of Church principles impossible. Need any thing more be said to show the hopelessness of the Anglo-Catholic's position? He is forced by his Church to seek his proof from Scripture: if he fails, as fail he inevitably must, he must next try to extract it from the Primitive Church; but to do either he is compelled to employ the very principles which the Church theory was framed to exclude. He must be a Protestant, and act as a Protestant, and work with the Protestant instrument of private judgment, in order to obtain from the Word of God, or the chaos of ancient writings, a doctrine which shall cast out Protestantism and all its processes as false and Anti-Christian.

"Here we might take our stand, and regard the Protestant doctrine as fully established by the absence of every thing like an exclusive charter for Episcopacy. Nothing more is required to prove that an Episcopal Church possesses no superior right over any other, and that the doctrines of the Anglican Church are based upon an act of private judgment (whether performed by individuals or a body of clergymen), which declares them to be consonant with the Word of God."—pp. 31—33.

Now really we must say, that Mr. Price is most unjust in his argument here. We have already said, that we should be sorry to be obliged to maintain the theory of Anglo-Catholicism as stated by him; but putting aside for the present the merits of that system in itself, we do say, without hesitation, that the Anglo-Catholic if he *be* inconsistent, is not *more* so than the Roman Catholic. If he holds that there is authority, or even infallibility in the Church, and yet is obliged after all to build his faith on "the Word of God, or a chaos of ancient writings," he is only in the same predicament as the Roman Catholic, whose faith is equally built, in the first instance, on "the Word of God, or a chaos of ancient writings;" and in the case of each doctrine defined by his Church, on his *own inquiries* into the doctrines of his Church, or on some fallible testimony. So that really the Romanist is just as much dependent in every atom of his belief on the principle of private judgment and inquiry as the Anglo-Catholic is. We do not say that he is dependent in the same *mode*, but he is in all cases essentially dependent on the very principle he condemns.

There are various statements of fact in the last-cited passage of Mr. Price's article, which are inaccurately or very loosely worded. He is not borne out in his assertion that the Church of England "rejects" infallibility by the proofs he adduces. "In her Articles she proclaims the fact that the Church has erred." Speaking accurately, there is no such assertion to be found in the Articles. She declares indeed that the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, have erred; but she does not there affirm that "the Church" has erred, or that she has erred

herself. Mr. Price has no right to make the Articles say what they do *not* say. Again, "her separation from Rome" is spoken of as an admitted fact—the meaning being, evidently, that she went out, and formed a distinct communion, refusing to continue in communion with Rome. Mr. Price knows, we presume, that this is a disputed point, to say the least; that many persons would deny his assumption as inconsistent with fact. Again, he assumes, that since the Article declares that general Councils have erred, therefore it teaches that "all councils are amenable to the bar of Scripture," and that "there is no unerring organ of truth on earth." We must demur to this conclusion as not following necessarily from the premises. There is no such assertion in the Articles referred to as renders it impossible to hold that some decisions of councils are of binding authority; and the Anglo-Catholic is not involved in the difficulty which Mr. Price tries to entangle him in. If he judges from examination of the Scripture, and of "the chaos of ancient writings," that some decisions of the Church in past ages are supported by an authority which he deems irresistible; or if he is satisfied from the same authorities, that an Episcopal form of Church government is essential, he may be wrong in his view, but he is not more inconsistent or less logically consequent, than the Roman Catholic who believes, without any infallible decision on the fact, that certain synods in former ages were infallible, and that others were fallible.

Having thus endeavoured to show that the praises lavished on the logical consistency of Romanism at the expense of Anglo-Catholicism are not merited, we would now advert to another branch of the subject, and a very important one. What are the principles which Mr. Price and his coadjutors recommend, by way of rooting out all tendencies to Romanism? What are these antagonistic principles which are to dry up the evil at its source?

Mr. Price thus states what he conceives to be the logical and spiritual contradictories of the Anglo-Catholic theory, and of Romanism.

"Now the two cardinal principles of Protestantism, which at the Reformation overthrew the Church of Rome, and are the foundation of every Protestant Church, are these: the sole and paramount supremacy of the Word of God, as interpreted by private judgment; and the inherent right of every separate society of Christians throughout the world to institute for itself its own form of Church Government. Protestantism does not assert that all forms of ecclesiastical polity are equally good, nor that the judgment of one man is as trustworthy as another's in the exposition of Scripture: but it does maintain that the faith professed by each Church rests ultimately on the interpretation

which that Church has, independently for itself, put upon Revelation ; and that the full participation in the benefits of Christianity is not attached to any particular form of Church Government."—pp. 22, 23.

Now in this statement two ideas are introduced. We have, in the first place, the supremacy of the Word of God "as interpreted by *private judgment*." We have afterwards "the faith professed by each *Church*," and the "interpretation which that *Church*" has for itself put on revelation. Here are two ideas. There is the private judgment of each *individual*, and there is the private judgment of the *Church*. Let us see what further light is thrown on this by Mr. Price in the course of his article. Does he recognize the full and unfettered right of the private judgment of an individual to dissent from the faith of his own Church, and of every other? It is to be expected of course, that a writer who attaches so much weight to clearness of principle and consistency of logic, should himself be clear in his views—should himself be able to take a clear and consistent ground. We only seek for what is reasonable in expecting thus much from Mr. Price. Well then, what are the statements which he subsequently makes in explanation of his view?

He maintains (p. 27) "Protestantism," by which he means "a vindication for the whole Christian community of rights which confessedly belong to it, *i. e.* the right of choosing its own "Church polity." He asserts (p. 28) "the right of each society to govern itself." He says (p. 28) that "a Church may choose to govern itself according to the Apostolical model, be it Episcopal or Presbyterian," but has no right to condemn others. He adds that "each Christian community" may determine its polity for itself. Now, is it, or is it not meant, that if a Church—such for example as the Church of England was before the Reformation—should concur in a particular interpretation of Scripture, and thereon establish a certain form of Church polity and a certain body of doctrine ; such a form of Church polity is established according to God's will, and is binding in some degree on individuals? As far as we can see, Mr. Price appears to be of opinion that it is so ; for he remarks (p. 37) that the very key stone of the Protestant argument lies in the assertion that "the men who made up the Reformed Church of England were the same men as had constituted the Roman Catholic Church of England ;" for "the Protestant builds his Church on the exercise by the Christian Society of England of its right to govern itself," and therefore the pre-existence of the body to exercise such a right is necessary to the proof of its actual exercise. He speaks (p. 38) of "a distinct assertion [at the Reformation] on the part of English Christians, of their prerogative of framing

an ecclesiastical constitution for themselves ;" and he speaks of "a new government," not "deriving its authority from the sanction or decree of its predecessor." And he goes on to affirm that "the Reformation asserted in the ecclesiastical, the same truths which centuries later civil revolutions have established and are establishing in the secular world—the nullity, namely, of divine right, and the supreme sovereignty of society over all its concerns and relations." Mr. Price further guards expressly against the notion that the Protestant principle, as advocated by him, leads to anarchy, or to latitudinarianism. He rejects "ultra-Protestantism" in a certain sense, and reiterates his comparison between the obligations of civil and ecclesiastical society.

"But the phrase may be intended to convey a different meaning. It may signify a repudiation of all social obligation for Christians, a restricting of the Christian religion to a personal and solitary relation between God and each individual Christian, a virtual negation of the very idea of a Church ; or if so gross a reproach is not intended, the expression may be meant to suggest loose notions of government, general laxity of the social bond, liberty of forming new associations, without any sense of responsibility, on the impulse of mere caprice, or such an ascribing of equal virtues to every form of outward polity as is tantamount to indifference towards all. If such is the charge brought against the denial of the divine right of bishops, we meet it with the question, whether the disbelief in the divine and exclusive right of monarchy is sufficient to convict any Englishman of being a republican or an anarchist ? Is the opinion that the title of Queen Victoria has the will of the nation for its charter incompatible with the warmest loyalty for her person, the deepest reverence for her high office, or the sincerest attachment to monarchy ? Is every consistent constitutionalist driven to the miserable alternative of being obliged to account her an usurper of a throne which belongs to a more direct line, or of holding that monarchical government has no independent root in the well understood interests, the enlightened reason, and the sober affections of the people of England ?"—pp. 77, 78.

These views are, we think, very plainly and distinctly stated. The society of Christians in each country may exercise its free judgment in the meaning of Scripture, and may choose whatever form of doctrine and polity it deliberately prefers. If it likes to be Episcopal, it may be Episcopal. If it likes to be Presbyterian, or Congregationalist, Baptist, or Methodist, or any thing else, it may be so. It has full power and authority to do so. It is an essential principle of Protestantism that it has this power. The Society in each country may be compared to the temporal power. The people have in either case the power of settling the form of Church government and determining the doctrine of the Church,

and of reforming either when necessary. The laws established in either case are inconsistent with anarchy, or the notion that every individual may act just as he likes, without obedience to any rules, or in accordance with his own choice and will only.

It must be admitted that this is, as far as it goes, a very intelligible theory. It is in fact that of Dr. Arnold. It recognizes an authority in the Church—an authority which springs from the popular will. According to this principle, were the people of England to have adopted the Presbyterian form of government at the Reformation, and the Scottish people to have adopted the Episcopal, they would have acted with perfect propriety, and there would have been an obligation on all individuals in these countries to adhere to those forms. Nay, suppose England and Scotland were to exchange their forms of polity by the action of the popular will, the obligations of individuals towards Episcopacy and Presbyterianism in each country would be reversed from what they now are. But there is here one little difficulty, which we must be pardoned for alluding to. We cannot conceive how, if every nation has full authority to frame its form of government and to model its doctrine as it pleases, it would be possible to deny to a people the right to adopt Irvingism or Mormonism. Perhaps Mr. Price might see no great difficulty in this. But we will advance another step. Suppose, then, that a nation should be persuaded that the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are superfluous and unlawful, and should regulate their ritual on that of the Quakers. Or suppose them to be convinced that the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement are fables and superstitious errors, and to model their religious system on a repudiation of them both. Would Mr. Price be still prepared to maintain the absolute inherent right of this people to model its doctrine and discipline on its own views of the meaning of Scripture? And to come to what appears to us a still more perplexing question. If the power of the people in religious matters is the sole principle on which we are to determine the lawfulness and propriety of religious institutions; and if the people have the power of remodelling their ecclesiastical organization, just as it is supposed that they may in temporal matters alter the constitution, and replace despotism by constitutional government, or aristocracy by democracy, or democracy by despotism; on what principle could Mr. Price deny to the people of England the full right to establish the Papacy and the Roman Catholic religion to-morrow, instead of Protestantism, if they held that Scripture warranted their so doing?

We are really glad to have an opportunity of bringing matters to a fair issue with these "liberal" writers in the "Edinburgh

Review," the "Daily News," &c. They are perpetually imputing inconsistency, contradiction, and absurdity to every one who does not speak their Shibboleth. They are for ever repeating that their principles alone can guard us against Popery—that they only are consistent and logical. Now it is clear, that on their principle there is really no safeguard against Romanism. They are bound to maintain the lawfulness of an ecclesiastical revolution which should place us again under Romanism, provided it were done by the will of the people. Mr. Price, and those who think with him, could not offer any effective opposition in the way of argument to such a move. He admits (p. 27) that the Roman Church possesses a "lawful government," and that its ministers are "lawful ministers of Christ." He reckons it as one of the Churches of Christ (p. 62). Persons who think with him object to the Church of Rome, not on account of its perverse dogmas, but on account of its usurpations. They refuse to enter into the question whether Romanism is in accordance with the objective truth as revealed in God's word. They will have the matter settled on the right of nations to choose their own doctrine and polity. Well, what if nations choose the Romish doctrine and polity? What have our friends to say in that case? And with what consistency can they go to the French nation, or the Spaniards, or the Italians, and blame them for adhering to Romanism? The simple reply would be, "We are satisfied that the Scripture tells us the Church of Rome is infallible, and that its religion is true."

The reader will now have seen how far reasoners of this kind are to be trusted as effective or consistent in their opposition to Rome. But let us look at the question in another point of view.

Mr. Price, then, asserts again and again, the right of every Church, every Christian "society," every Christian "community," to regulate its own doctrine and discipline; and he explains his meaning by comparing the reform of a Church to the legislation of a state. He disclaims ultra-Protestantism; and would not be understood to mean that there is "no social obligation for Christians," or "that the Christian religion is restricted to a personal and solitary relation between God and each individual, a virtual *negation of the very idea of a Church*," or to approve "loose notions of government," "laxity of the social bond," "liberty of forming new associations, without any sense of responsibility, on the impulse of mere caprice," or "such an ascribing of equal virtues to every form of outward polity as is tantamount to indifference towards them all" (p. 77). Now we ask, what is the meaning of all this? We think the meaning is tolerably plain. It was felt by the writer that the theories advocated in opposition

to Anglo-Catholicism, might by some persons be regarded as opening the door to a dangerous laxity. In point of fact, it appears from his Preface, that there were some misgivings on such points in quarters which needed some attention to be paid to their scruples; and the result has been the introduction of the very strong qualifications above referred to in page 77 of his article. The object of these qualifications is to show that the theory which he describes as "Protestant" does not deny the social obligation of Christians, or encourage dissent on the impulse of caprice, or lead to indifference towards every outward polity or every doctrine. In short, we are to be led to believe, that the principle of the absolute right of Christian communions to adopt whatever doctrine and discipline they please, is consistent with maintaining the social obligation of Christians and the idea of a Church; that is, holding that Christians ought to remain in communion with their brethren, and not make causeless divisions, and not become indifferent to all doctrines and polities. This is all very well, but it is, in fact, borrowed to some extent from a system in which dissent, separation, and want of adherence to a revealed system of faith, are considered as evils. It is borrowed from the Church system—borrowed, not from human reasoning, but from the Bible. So then, Mr. Price, as well as the Anglo-Catholics, holds that there is *some* kind of obligation to adhere to the Church. He denies indeed that episcopacy is of Divine right, but he deprecates dissent and latitudinarianism. He would have men remain in the Church of England, and not form separate communions from caprice. He holds that the Church of England is fallible, and yet recognizes some duty in individuals to remain in her communion. He is in favour of social Christianity, not merely solitary and individual. Now all we can say of principles like this, is, that they who advocate them have no right to attack those members of the Church of England who regard dissent as unlawful, and who hold that the people ought to be in communion with the Church. What more do they contend for than Mr. Price himself admits? If they are inconsistent in deprecating dissent, and yet in admitting that the Church of England is fallible, Mr. Price is equally inconsistent; and if it comes to be a question of consistency and reason, we would submit that those who are satisfied from the Word of God that the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England are actually in accordance with God's revelation, and that there is no reason or cause for dissenting from either, have a distinct, clear, and consistent ground on which they can judge of other communions as well as their own. And on the other hand, we are unable to see with what consistency those who maintain the right

of every community of Christians to form its own doctrine and polity on its own view of Scripture, can object to any amount of division, or contrariety of religious tenets to any established doctrine. For they set aside altogether the question of truth or falsehood as any test of right or wrong in religion. They acknowledge as their sole test, whether a community of professing Christians has arrived at certain conclusions by the exercise of its reasoning powers. Nor do they define whether this community of Christians must be large or small. So that they cannot consistently object to separation from a system which is founded on private opinion, and which has no right to assume that it is more in accordance with God's will than any other system; and if any two or more persons agree to form a new system, they are, according to Mr. Price's theory, invested with full and absolute power by the *essential* principles of Protestantism to do so. We must really say, that after this, to talk of the obligation of Christian unity, of social religion, and of maintaining the idea of a Church, is pure absurdity. Now here we would beg not to be misunderstood, as if we intended to derogate in any way from the right of private judgment, properly understood, or to deny the rights of conscience to any one. But we do say this, that after Mr. Price and those who think with him, have denied to every Christian Church and denomination alike, the right to regard their own religious system as Scriptural and obligatory, and after they have asserted the right of every body of Christians to reform and alter their systems in any direction to any extent they judge proper and fitting, it is rather too much to come forward with objections to schism, and separation, and latitudinarianism, as if some positive and objective truth were held essential; and to condemn all those who on clear and intelligible grounds object equally with himself to schism and separation.

Having thus noticed the gross inconsistencies and absurdities into which opposite extremes fall, in their attempt to clutch at some theory which will in reality substitute man for God—human authority for Divine—the Pope or the individual for the Word of God, we now proceed to state what is the actual position of a member of the Church of England, and to show the consistency and method of his faith.

The English Churchman—we do not at present speak of any other Christian, but will do so hereafter—reasons thus. He has in his hands the Scriptures, and, without assuming the infallibility of his own or of any other Church, he has within his reach sufficient evidence that those Scriptures are genuine, authentic, and inspired. He has evidence of the same kind, founded on common sense and matter of fact, as those which determine his belief in

all other matters. He therefore acts rationally and consistently in believing the Scriptures, as placed in his hands, to be the Word of God. He is, both in theory and practice, given the fullest liberty to compare the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England with the Word of God. He does so to a greater or less extent, and from all he sees, he is satisfied that the doctrines and discipline of his Church are in accordance with God's word, and in no case opposed to it. When he has gained this point he is a member of the Church of England, not merely by habit or persuasion, but in principle and conviction. Besides this, he is, perhaps, one who can consult the records of history, and he is enabled to gain the further satisfaction of knowing, that not only are the faith and discipline of his Church, in accordance with what appears to him the evident meaning of God's word, but that the same doctrine and discipline in all essential points were received by the early Christians—that the Creeds of his own Church are monuments of the earliest faith—that there have been abundant witnesses to that faith and discipline in later ages. Such facts as these are certainly calculated to add to his confidence in the Church of which he is a member. Now, we really put it to common sense, whether there is any thing irrational, or inconsistent, in this course of argument. It does not in any degree interfere with the private judgment of the individual who thus reasons: it assumes his private judgment throughout. Well, let us suppose the Churchman thus proceeding on the principle of private judgment, to arrive at the conclusion that certain doctrines are positively revealed in God's word, and are obligatory on all Christians; and that certain sacraments, and even a certain polity or mode of ordination are either absolutely requisite, or that they cannot be omitted without serious peril. How, we ask, can such a person, if he consistently acts on the right of private judgment, hesitate to say that the one or the other is essential, or may not be omitted without sin? Nay, even supposing that the person in question should be of opinion that the Word of God, and the facts of history, bear him out in believing that there have been some judgments or decisions of the Universal Church, which are binding on Christians in after times, as resting on the authority of God's word. Is he inconsistent, in believing that he himself and others are bound by those decisions? He may be more or less mistaken in those views. He may be mistaken on every point of his belief. But what we say is, that there is no obvious absurdity, or inconsistency, in his mode of argument; and that it is impossible to say to the Churchman, that any condemnation of those who think differently from him is inconsistent with the right of

private judgment, when it is precisely by acting on that right that he is obliged to condemn what he sees clearly to be contrary to the revealed will of God.

We would not be understood to restrict this to members of the Church of England. We hold that every one, who pursues the same course in reference to the religious society to which he belongs, and arrives at analogous conclusions, is consistent in his reasoning, though he may be mistaken. The dissenter who, on this principle, holds that Church establishments are unlawful is in error, but there is no palpable error in the form of his reasoning. The Romanist, one who begins by building Scripture on the infallibility of the Church, and then the infallibility of the Church on Scripture, is guilty of a paralogism which vitiates his whole system.

We now turn to Mr. Price's remarks on the Anglo-Catholic theory, or "that theory of Ecclesiastical polity which is commonly known by the name of Church principles." To this theory Mr. Price ascribes the mischief of secessions to Rome. "Church principles," he says, "determine the relation of each man to Christ by his relation to the Church" (p. 19). This Church is supposed to be universal, apostolic, visible; its essential characteristic is unity. Communion with it is essential to salvation. The sacraments are possessed exclusively by the Church; it has power and authority from Christ to declare the truth; its priesthood is derived from the Apostles by succession, and they alone are ministers of Christ (pp. 24, 25). These principles, he says, lead necessarily and absolutely to Rome, so that the only wonder is, that every one who holds them has not become a Romanist. They do so, he contends, because the Church of England is wholly excluded from Catholicity by them. She does not claim infallibility; she is isolated and cut off from communion with the great body, of what is admitted to be the Church and the Apostolical Episcopate. She separated from this unity; her reformation was a revolution; it is illegitimate on Church principles; it was not the result of any regular and deliberate enactment by her spiritual rulers; it was carried on by the temporal power, and forced on the Clergy: the Church of England had no right, as a minority, to effect any reformation, and separate from the majority of the Church; it was not sanctioned by any General Council; there was no appeal to any such authority: to reform a national Church independently of the universal Church, is to act on the principle of Protestantism, and to deny Church principles: national Churches have no recognized place in the Catholic system, as divinely organized unities; they are dependent on mere secular arrangements, and spring from them.

Such, in general, is Mr. Price's argument, in proof of the position that what he describes as "Church" or "Anglo-Catholic" principles, are the source of the secessions which we witness.

There is, undeniably, much truth in this statement; it is a simple matter of fact, that such views as Mr. Price refers to, have, in many instances, actually issued in secession to Rome. And, in following out the course of reasoning which he supposes to take place, there seems nothing to prevent secession. He very justly remarks, that in most cases of secession, there has been an absence of inquiry into the particulars of religious doctrine and practice—that the one question has been, "Which is the true Church?"—and that the Church is assumed to be possessed of such authority, that, whatever may be our private opinions, we are bound to accept religion in trust from her; we have no right to inquire: we may set aside all examination into the teaching of God's word, or the sentiments of the early Christians. Now this is the simple fact, in many instances, perhaps in most instances. It is also quite true, as Mr. Price states, that views of the same complexion are prevalent to no inconsiderable extent amongst persons who have no notion of forsaking the Church of England, and that such persons are thereby placed in a perilous position, and are peculiarly liable to fall as others have done before them.

But while we would most fully and unreservedly concur with Mr. Price in this statement, we must add, that if his representation of what he calls "Church principles" is meant to extend to all, or even the majority of those who are commonly reported to hold such principles, it is exaggerated and incorrect. For instance, with reference to one of the principal points which he puts forward as being held "essential" to the Church, namely, its unity, he will find that not only do all "Anglo-Catholics" recognize by the very fact of their position, the existence of one Universal Church, which is divided into different communions; but he will find them lamenting this division, and desirous of contributing to its termination. It is obvious, that when men do this, they do not recognize external unity of communion in the Universal Church as an essential, however desirable it may be. And therefore their theory, so far, does not lead necessarily to Rome, because it assumes that Catholic unity may be adhered to in different communions. So far, they assert nothing more than what Mr. Price himself holds, and what all Protestants hold.

They hold in the next place, according to Mr. Price, that the Sacraments are exclusively possessed by the Church, and that the Church alone has an Apostolic ministry; and they unchurch

Lutherans, and Dissenters, and Presbyterians, as having no true sacraments or ministry. We admit the truth of this to a certain extent. It is not unusual to hear expressions with reference to non-episcopal societies, which appear to exceed the bounds of truth and charity as much in one direction, as we have in the other to lament the existence of a latitudinarian spirit. But whatever may be the opinions entertained as to the ordinations and succession of the ministry, or the administration of the Sacraments, there is positively no reason why they should determine men towards Rome, rather than to the Greek Church, or to the Church of England; for those who hold these views consider these attributes to be possessed by the Church of England and the Greek Church as much as by any other. And so, again, with regard to the authority of the Church in teaching—its power to define the faith in General Councils—we would just say the same. If men believe that the Church is divided into several branches, they cannot recognize a binding authority over the whole in any one branch. They can only recognize in each a certain amount and kind of authority extending over its own members, and that not infallible in itself. They may be found recognizing a binding authority in the judgments of the undivided Church before Rome became separated from Greece, and England from Rome, which they do not ascribe to the divided Church, or any part of it. And we say with confidence, that while a man holds these principles, they do not by inference lead him to Rome. He may be correct or incorrect in his views in this or that point; but we maintain, without fear of effectual refutation, that such views do not, and never have led to Rome, as long as they are held to. Of course, if a man shifts from this ground, and takes up a different class of principles, he may readily become a Romanist. For instance, if any one becomes dissatisfied with the idea of a divided Church, and assumes that the Universal Church must necessarily be strictly one in communion, subject to one supreme undivided government, apostolical in its antiquity, and in possession of an infallible tribunal, ready at all times to pronounce on all questions that may arise, we can only say, that he has adopted all the great principles of the Romish argument, and is bound, in consistency, to join the Church of Rome. But where this view is not taken, there is no logical inference to be drawn in favour of joining the Romish communion. The actual evil however is, that at present there are persons nominally attached to the Church of England, and professedly holding “Anglo-Catholic” or “Church” principles, who are really holding Roman Catholic views, and who, being mixed up with others, are secretly under-

mining their faith. The existence of a "Romanizing" party is quite evident and undeniable, and the sooner it is got rid of and driven out the better.

Mr. Price, and a class of persons who think with him, that Episcopacy is a non-essential, and that all societies of professing Christians have the full and unlimited right of adopting whatever doctrine and discipline they think conformable to God's word, and that all are equally pleasing to God, such persons, we say, would fain persuade us, that the recognition of any Church system as essentially Divine, and resting on the basis of Truth and Revelation, is dangerous and Popish. If we hold Episcopacy to be of higher than human institution, we must go to Rome, say these gentlemen. What would they say if we should hold Episcopacy to be Divine, and yet deny that Rome has a true Episcopacy? Would the principle lead to Rome in that case? And yet it is perfectly competent to one who holds the Divine right of Episcopacy to argue thus. What, if we should hold the Sacrament to be administered validly only by an Episcopally ordained Ministry, and yet deny that it is validly or lawfully administered in the Church of Rome? And yet this is a view that has been taken before now. We ask these questions, merely for the purpose of showing that Mr. Price and others argue on mere assumption, when they assert broadly and without exception, or distinction, that "High Church," or "Church," or "Anglo-Catholic" principles of Ecclesiastical polity, as they explain them, necessarily lead to Romanism.

And we would here observe that Mr. Price has omitted what is a far more potent inducive, in our opinion, to secession from the Church of England—we mean the Theological system of what, we must designate by a recognized term, as "Tractarianism." Throughout his Article Mr. Price refrains from theology as being the cause of secessions. He says (p. 18) "Church principles, we are aware, is a comprehensive term, including certain views of theology as well as of ecclesiastical polity: in the using the phrase, we restrict its meaning to the latter element only, as being the cause of the defections we are deploring." Now surely this is a great mistake. It may be very true that persons care very little about theological questions, when they come to investigate the Claims of the Church of Rome; but Mr. Price may rest assured, that theological questions have had a great share in bringing them to the point of making that investigation, with a willingness to be determined in favour of Rome. What have men been taught? They have been taught that Justification by Faith is a Lutheran and heretical doctrine. They have been taught the efficacy of penances and mortifica-

tions in atoning for sin—the high and extreme desirableness of auricular confession to a priest—the duty of adoring Christ in the Sacred Elements—the lawfulness of invoking the Saints—the probability of a Purgatory in some sense—the existence of counsels of perfection, and the high merit of virginity, and of poverty, obedience, and the monastic state. They have been led to look on austerities as signs of saintliness—to dwell on external observances, on forms, on spiritual exercises of devotion, more than on the renewing and sanctifying influences of God's Spirit, as the means of holiness. They have been taught to imbibe the spirit of Romish devotions, and to model their practice as far as possible on the forms of Romish ceremonial and worship. They have been accustomed habitually to look up to Rome as the model of all that is elevated, Catholic, and saintly. They have been told that high and saintly virtues, angelic devotion, and all the grander virtues of Christian faith, are unsuited to the sphere of Anglicanism—that they are to be looked for elsewhere. They have been taught that the Articles are the fruit of an uncatholic age—that they are uncatholic in their tone, if not in their sentiments—that the Reformation from which they emanated was conducted by heretics, and that the Rituals and offices of the Church, her discipline and polity, and all her system, were tainted, polluted, mutilated, deformed by the influence of heresy—that she gradually recovered from that influence, and may be considered to have preserved the bare essentials of spiritual life. They have been taught that our duty is not to find or point out defects or errors in the Church of Rome, nay, to abstain from entering on any such course, but to learn and mourn over the shortcomings and corruptions of our own communion. They have learnt to gloss over every Romish error—to look on all who speak boldly against Rome, as uncatholic in doctrine, or unchristian in spirit, or otherwise undeserving of trust.

And what have they seen next? They have seen that such views are strongly condemned by the great body of the Church of England—by its Bishops, and by its members generally. They have also seen all who held such views virtually cut off from all prospect of being given the power of carrying them out in the government of the Church. They have felt a ban upon them. They have been censured and condemned. They have seen their chief teachers secede in despair. If Mr. Price imagines that such circumstances as these have had no effect in leading men to Rome, we think that few would be disposed to concur in that opinion. In omitting the theological part of the question, and sending us to views of “Church polity” as the source—the only source of perversions to Rome, he may act with some temporary advantage

to the object he is desirous of effecting; but he is assuredly taking a very unjust, and a very limited, as well as an unsound and dangerous view of the whole question.

We would offer here some few additional observations on the ecclesiastical theory of "High-Churchman" or "Anglo-Catholics," to which we have adverted above. We have shown that this theory does not necessarily, as usually held, lead to secession to Rome. But we must add, that it does not, in itself, hold out any safeguard against Rome. A man is not, perhaps, rendered safer against Romish delusions, by adopting the "High Church" view; but we do say, that he need not be less safe. The true security against Rome lies in the conviction founded on the Word of God, that her pretensions are unfounded, her doctrines erroneous, and her practice idolatrous. If this intelligent appreciation of the great real grounds of difference be not presupposed, the Low Churchman will be just as liable to be led away by the claims of Rome as the High Churchman; and we should say, that in all cases, this intelligent conviction is demanded as the foundation on which all our views of Church polity may afterwards be safely formed.

We see by lamentable experience, that notwithstanding the signature of the Articles, men too often come to the consideration of Church principles without any intelligent conviction of the truth of the Articles; and we therefore cannot wonder that they go astray. It would be a great mistake to imagine, or to act on the persuasion, that views of ecclesiastical polity alone will protect men against Romanism. We undoubtedly see instances, occasionally, in which this is forgotten. Young persons are sometimes set down to the study of works on the Church, or of ecclesiastical polity, when no care has been taken to instruct them in the grounds of objection to Romish assumptions or tenets—when, in fact, they have not yet learnt the doctrines of their own Church. Now this cannot fail to have injurious effects, in leading minds without sufficient ballast to investigations which are abstruse and difficult. It leads to speculation without affording the necessary materials and grounds for guiding the mind; and we conceive that to this reversal of the right course of instruction, or rather to the omission of all training and instruction on the points of difference between ourselves and Romanists, is to be ascribed much of the unsettledness which all sincere members of the Church of England have to lament.

We would say to parents, guardians, tutors, and teachers, Do not hastily introduce the young to the study of abstract questions of Church polity, until you have first instructed them thoroughly in the evidences of religion—in its great verities—and in the

leading doctrines of their own Church. Let them feel convinced intellectually of the truth of the statements in the Articles in opposition to Rome, and then you may safely introduce them to the questions of ecclesiastical polity. Let their principles be well assured, before you launch them on theories, however important.

We would say to the public generally, Do not too hastily condemn every one who holds Episcopacy a sacred and divine thing, and who regards the Church of England as an Apostolical Church—Apostolical in its ministry and in its sacraments. These principles have been held in former ages by many of the firmest opponents of Romanism: they are still held by many who are thankful for the reformation of the Church, and who are, on principle, opposed as strongly as men can be to Romanism. Do not suppose that every one who objects on principle to dissent from the English Church, or who doubts of the validity or lawfulness of dissenting ministrations, is a Romanist in heart. And do not let yourselves be persuaded, from a mere fear of Romanism, to adopt any latitudinarian view, to deny or overlook the fact that God has made a Revelation, and that *this Revelation*, and not merely each individual's view of it, is binding on us all. Remember that there is an unchangeable truth, and that all doctrines and Churches are not to be placed on a level.

To the "Anglo-Catholic," in Mr. Price's sense of the term, we would say: Experience has shown that persons to whom you looked up with confidence as your teachers, have experienced changes of view on the most important doctrinal subjects. Ought not this fact to point out the evil of depending on the judgment of individuals, with the implicit trust which you have had, and perhaps still have? Can you continue to be guided so absolutely by party connexions after all that has occurred? Are you not aware that there are individuals now associated with your friends, who are known to be Romanizing? Have you not seen one man after another adopt extreme views and practices, and secede? What security is there in the connexion in which you now are? Can you feel any well-grounded certainty that your friends may not be Romanists sooner or later? We put these questions, not in any hostile spirit, but simply as suggesting most serious inquiries on matters affecting your highest interests. Have you, we would inquire, looked in the first place to the will of God in His revealed Word? Have you been guided by that Word or by the works of this or that individual man? Have you examined the doctrines of your own Church, and satisfied yourself by careful comparison with the Word of God, that they are true and sound? If you are now in doubt and perplexity, may it not have arisen from your own deficiency in some of the leading principles of religion which you

ought to have settled in the first instance? And are you, with all these facts before you, entitled to claim the possession of exclusive orthodoxy? Are you, who as a party, are unsettled on so many points, fitted to undertake the office of ruling or reforming the Church, or of repressing error? Uncertain on so many points as you are, and inconsistent in various respects—is it for you to pronounce sentence of condemnation against every one who may differ from you? Is it not rather your duty to wait in modesty and self-distrust until your own position is ascertained, and in the mean time to refrain from denouncing as a heretic, or an unfaithful and inconsistent Churchman, every one who does not belong to your party, or adopt your formula, or express his belief in the terms you prefer?

And now to pass on to other subjects. We would in the first place express our concurrence with those, who believe the Church of England and Ireland to be the true Catholic and Apostolic Church in this kingdom. We believe it to be doctrinally in accordance with the Word of God, and we regard its polity as Scriptural and Apostolic. We hold it to be so, because, having examined the Word of God, and compared it with the tenets of the national Church, we have observed in all instances a full concurrence. As for the form of Church polity in particular, it is a system which has undeniably existed, and been universal in all ages from the beginning. It existed before the Papacy arose, as the more enlightened Romanists, such as Moehler, De Maistre, and Newman admit. We see no where, either in the Old or New Testament, any power given to communities of professing Christians to form their own ecclesiastical polity, nor any instances in which their call alone was sufficient to qualify persons for the office of the Ministry. We even find their right expressly denied¹. On the other hand, we find Episcopacy universal, apostolical, and Scriptural, though there is no direct injunction on the subject in the Word of God; and we therefore deem it a duty to maintain that discipline ourselves, and to recommend it to others, while we see no warrant in Scripture for pronouncing that all other ministrations must necessarily be invalid, and that the Church cannot exist in any way, where this apostolical discipline does not exist.

The continuity of this polity, of the sacraments, of the chief rites of the Church, of the reception of the same Scriptures, the profession of the same Creeds, and of the same leading positive doctrines of Christianity, establishes the essential identity and continuance of this Church in all ages. The Reformation of the

¹ 2 Tim. iv. 3.

Church of England was a great and most salutary change, removing a mass of errors and corruptions which for a series of ages had been gathering around Christianity, and in some respects obscuring or subverting its doctrines. The remainder of the universal Church, being either separated from our communion, as in the East, or under the sway of the Papacy, as in the West, it was evidently a matter of necessity for us to proceed in the work of reform, without the concurrence of a General Council, or of the See of Rome. The general duty of all ministers and pastors to teach the truth of the Gospel, and to expel false doctrines, and the analogous duties of all Christians in their respective stations, were the warrant for the reform which was carried on by the State, by many of the authorities of the Church, and by the people. It is true, as Mr. Price objects, that every act of the Reformation did not take place in Synod—that sometimes the Bishops were opposed to it—that there was sometimes force—that there were some irregularities. This objection does not invalidate what then occurred; it took place, sooner or later, with the consent, if not with the active concurrence of the whole community, State and Church; it was right and necessary in itself; it was carried, on the whole, by common authority; and being in accordance with clear Christian duty, it was the work of God, and is to be held as His work.

We are met by the objection that all this issued in a division—that the Church of England is isolated, and separated from communion with other Churches—and yet that the true universal Church is only *one* in her communion and government. We answer, by calling on the objectors to produce a single passage from Scripture, in which unity of outward communion is declared to be an essential and invariable attribute of the Church. Nay, further, we call on them to produce any definition of that kind from any of the œcumenical Synods. Let them even produce, if they can, any definition of their own Council of Trent to that effect. They cannot do so, and therefore their objection is merely the result of their private judgment, and we are prepared to show that their private judgment is wrong.

Here, perhaps, Mr. Price may object to us that we are basing the Church altogether on private judgment; that we recognize the Protestant principle, and if so, we must allow that every one has a perfect right to dissent from the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. Now it is quite true that we found faith in the Church on private judgment. The Romanist does so likewise; and the question of the influence of private judgment in either case is only a question of degree. But we are certainly not bound to admit the right of every one to oppose and reject

what our own private judgment tells us to be revealed by God. Others may think differently from us, and we cannot help their doing so ; but if we think they reject what is the revealed will of God, we are obliged by the very principle of private judgment, to hold that they do wrong. We recognize a considerable *authority* in the Church of England also ; and although that authority is not infallible, it is not to be despised or lightly rejected. Youth admits authority in age ; tried integrity and wisdom have an authority of their own ; a minister of God has authority ; a bishop has official authority ; the collective judgment of many clergy and bishops has authority ; the practice and doctrine of a Church, with all its bishops, clergy, and laity, for ages, have authority. They are deserving of respect from individuals ; they ought to have weight. They should determine the judgment in the absence of any clear and evident ground of objection from God's word. And besides this, the Church has inherent authority to carry out her belief by removing from her communion those who deny it. Here, then, is an authority which comes from the Divine Founder of the Church—but which is not infallible, and which is only known by private judgment.

And this intermediate authority we see in the Word of God as existing amongst the chosen people. With them priests and judges decided all causes, and yet were not infallible. In the New Testament the believers are directed to follow the faith of their teachers—to obey them. Ministers of Christ are set over his Church to feed them, to teach them, to admonish them. And yet here was certainly no infallible authority necessary. We are directed to hear the Church, and it is spoken of as the pillar and ground of truth ; and yet infallibility is not ascribed to it. Some Churches *did* go astray, even in the Apostolic times. The authority of the English Church is neither greater nor less than that which we see particular Churches to have possessed in the Apostolic times. It is not infallible, and yet it is deserving of obedience and reverence. It exercises no dominion over faith, but it has the right to teach and to keep that which is committed to it. To deny the existence and the usefulness of all authority unless it be infallible, would be to subvert all existing authorities, and would amount to the same absurdity in religious matters as it would be in civil matters to refuse all obedience except to the supreme legislative power—to deny the authority of judges, magistrates, and civil authorities generally, because their actions might be mistaken, or their proceedings inconsistent with the intention of the Legislator.

ART. VII.—1. *The Crescent and the Cross.* London: Bentley.

2. *Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers.* Bentley.

3. *Reginald Hastings.* Colburn. *Darien.* Colburn.

ASSUREDLY our loss—yes, we may say without exaggeration, our country's loss—is great, in him who has so recently departed from among us, summoned so hastily and so awfully away. Nor is it mainly as lovers of literature that we deplore that loss, though we acknowledge the delightful talents of the author; rather as the man—the gentleman, the English gentleman—has England occasion, in our judgment, to mourn for the premature departure of one, of whom it might be truly said, that the spirit of ancient chivalry seemed to have revived in his person. We, who trace these lines, were not personally acquainted with Eliot Warburton, but we know several of those who were; and their testimony seems unanimous upon this point, as to the perfect amiability and honourable manliness of the character of the departed; and, indeed, the perusal of his works must force a conviction of their author's moral worth, upon any reader endued with powers of observation. Free from those excesses and exaggerations which have sometimes been found to characterize “Young England” (so-called), Mr. Warburton would rather seem to have been a most favourable specimen—or shall we say, a representative?—of the modern English gentleman; not altogether free, indeed, from those deficiencies to which that phase of character is apt to be liable; for what man is quite perfect?—but still, on the whole, an honour to his nation, and to his nation's literature. Mr. Warburton's would appear, indeed, to have been that peculiar order of character and of talent, which could scarcely ripen save under the influence of English institutions, of our admirable social polity, our unrivalled constitution, and, last not least, our pure and truthful Church; for Eliot Warburton was a consistent, though not an extreme Churchman. In him (and this is a peculiarly English characteristic) the love of truth and justice was carried almost to an excess, even as in Falkland of old time; the same earnest desire for peace, and for enjoying the sympathies of his fellow-men, seems to have distinguished our modern cavalier, as we may not unaptly term him, which marked the famous peer of old.

If the shadow of blame may be allowed to interpose its presence in the midst of the sunshine of such honourable eulogy, we

would observe, by way of warning for the future rather than of censure on the past, that the battle of this age against the spirit of insubordination and lawlessness, at least in our own country, must be fought,—not, indeed, with less love, with less conciliatory gentleness, but with rather more of fixed determination. We can, indeed, scarcely go too far in acknowledging whatsoever of good may abide in an opponent, for that is by far the likeliest method of winning that opponent to our side ; yet must we be very decided in the enunciation of our own principles, and stern in the upholding of them. In fine, a spirit of deep and solemn earnestness becomes more needful every hour, to counteract that easy indifferentism, which an advanced stage of civilization is especially apt to engender, and to repress those tendencies to democratic disorder and mob-sway, which must always find their place in a free country, and which are especially pressing and dangerous at the present season. Though assuredly they *ought* to have few charms for us Britons, when we have just witnessed their legitimate working-out in a neighbouring country, where the most absolute despotism, probably, in Europe, has just been established by means of universal suffrage, by favour of the sweet voices of the many-headed monster. Mr. Eliot Warburton was manifestly (judging from his works) a Conservative and a Churchman, and one of no mean stamp ; characterized mainly by gentleness of spirit, and highly honourable and truthful feelings ; emphatically an English gentleman ; and that word conveys much to those who are able to apprehend its bearings. We believe that that may well be said of Eliot Warburton, which was first spoken by Tennyson concerning the lamented Arthur Hallam, that he, namely,

“ So wore his outward best, and join’d
Each office of the social hour
To noble manners, as the flower
And native growth of noble mind,—

“ Nor ever narrowness or spite,
Or villain fancy fleeting by,
Drew in the expression of an eye
Where God and nature met in light ;

“ And thus he bore without abuse
The grand old name of Gentleman,
Defiled by every charlatan,
And soil’d with all ignoble use.”

—*In Memoriam*, pp. 171-2.

And to Eliot Warburton also, we apprehend, might the two

following noble verses, from the same grand elegy, be applied with equal aptness:—

“ High nature amorous of the good,
But touch'd with no ascetic gloom;
And passion pure in snowy bloom
Thro' all-the years of April blood.

“ A love of freedom rarely felt,
Of freedom in her regal seat
Of England, not the schoolboy heat,
The blind hysterics of the Celt.”

Such was Eliot Warburton: but on the man we will now gaze no longer; let us rather seek the reflection of those qualities in the author's works. They may all be found, and they have all been recognized in his valuable “Crescent and the Cross;” valuable, because reflecting so perfectly the better half of the tendencies and aspirations of the Anglo-Saxon mind in the nineteenth century. Even for future generations, when the more immediate interest of this picturesque and delightful narrative shall have passed away, it will possess a sterling interest and value, as a faithful record of the thoughts and sentiments, the very image of the inner man, of an English gentleman in the age that has just glided past us. Perhaps the thoroughly English tone of the book is its most marked peculiarity; its freedom from affectation, or excess of any kind; its moderation of judgment, its charity of temper, its truthfulness and honesty of purpose. It makes no pretensions to that tone of playful, yet oftentimes bitter satire, which distinguished Byron's letters, and “Eothen,” and may, therefore, at first sight, appear more common-place; yet it is not really so: there is no straining after effect, no effort of any kind; all is simply felt, and truthfully, yet powerfully, narrated. Mr. Warburton's appreciation of the beauties of nature was very deep and true; and many of the descriptions of natural scenes, both in this work and his novels, cannot be easily surpassed in picturesqueness or in beauty.

The only other production of this author's that we are acquainted with, besides “Reginald Hastings” and “Darien,” is his “Memoirs of Prince Rupert and the Cavaliers,” a very interesting historical, or rather biographical, work, on which we bestowed an article upon its first appearance. It is marked by the same qualities of fairness and candour which usually distinguish Eliot Warburton's writings; only suffering, as it appears to us, from an excess of liberality towards opponents. The battle-

scenes in this work are very vigorously portrayed ; and a most interesting and complete portraiture is presented to us of the hot Prince Rupert, the most daring, and sometimes reckless, of Cavaliers, who, at the same time, possessed one of the most powerful intellects of his day.

But though we esteem both "the Crescent and the Cross" and "the Memoirs of Prince Rupert" very highly, yet we think "Reginald Hastings" likely to survive them both in the thoughts and memories of men. Of "Darien" we will not speak at length: its theme is a more painful one ; and it seems to us to be painfully, though powerfully, treated. The descriptions of tropical scenery, however, which are introduced in this work, are exquisite, and there is much of excitement and power in the whole narrative. But, to our mind, a shadow of gloom hangs over this last production of its ill-fated author ; a kind of lurid air of mystery envelopes the whole creation. This may be fancy, on our part ; but it makes us shrink from entering upon a detailed examination of this doubtless remarkable romance. Criticism, indeed, is scarcely in place on such an occasion as the present ; and, besides, we repeat, that this romance has great merits ; only, more, perhaps, in its isolated scenes, than as a whole ; more, again, as a powerful narrative of actual, but painful occurrences, than on the score of any fictitious interest which the narrative may possess.

On the whole, we cannot but think that Mr. Warburton's great powers have been more happily displayed, in that so-called "Autobiography of Reginald Hastings," which we purpose to make the especial subject-matter of this brief article.

This is a most admirable record of the natural thoughts and feelings, and also of the highly-wrought adventures, of an English gentleman or nobleman in the days of the Martyr-king. The work is imbued from first to last with the spirit of loyalty, and of sober, yet cheerful, piety, while the interest of the narrative, with its many hair-breadth escapes and chances, has rarely been surpassed. It is far more than a clever novel, because it is an accurate and graphic delineation of the manners and chief events of one of the most important periods in English history. Its tone is throughout so pure, that it might be read by a father to his children, and yet so natural and so manly, that it cannot be said to omit any of the chief elements which went to make up the spirit of that age, though perhaps, in some cases, they may be tempered or softened down to beauty. There is enough to indicate without offence the cant of the Puritan, or the recklessness of the Cavalier ; the portrait is truthful, and yet we have rather the ideal of the original, than its exact fac-simile.

Let us now proceed, without attempting to accompany the hero through all his manifold adventures, to call attention to some of the chief features of this very delightful book. Nothing can well exceed the easy grace of the opening chapters. Without entering into any unnecessary details, Mr. Warburton has therein most graphically brought before us the interior of an English nobleman's household, in the age of Charles I.; and his delineation has every characteristic of truth. Nothing can be more natural than the way in which the supposed autobiographist enters on his self-set task, to relieve the tedium of captivity; and an air of reality is imparted to the whole narrative by this masterly introduction which we rarely find in works of fiction of this class; an effect which may almost be paralleled with the verisimilitude of De Foe, in his "*Memoirs of a Cavalier*." The portraiture of the noble Lord Hastings, so grave, so melancholy, so truthful, and so loyal, of Hugo, the gallant and interesting brother of the hero, of his gentle and early sainted mother, and of the lady of his love, Zillah, and her fair sister Phoebe, are all highly successful in their respective orders of delineation.

We shall not attempt, as we have said, to trace the progress of the narrative; but cannot forbear calling attention to the highly-wrought adventure in the fourth chapter, and again to the most masterly delineation of Lord Digby in the sixth, a character which is admirably preserved throughout the work, and may be considered a model of portrait painting. We pass on to the first battle, narrated at length in the work before us; and that is told with so much characteristic sympathy—sympathy both of the gentler and the more warlike order—that we shall take the liberty of presenting our readers with a long, and, in our judgment, a most admirable extract, the twelfth chapter, p. 81—86, which will enable them to form a distincter notion of Mr. Warburton's powers than any eulogy on our part, or any number of detached and shorter extracts, could have done. The reader will remember, that Reginald Hastings, the eldest son of Lord Hastings, and a Cavalier in the king's army, is himself the narrator of these stirring incidents:—

"I pass over the raising of the standard, and the consequent events, that are fresh in every recollection, and not easy to be obliterated. Never seemed a nation more reluctant than was England to go to war; but when once thoroughly uproused her efforts were prodigious. An army gathered round the King, as if by magic; and when we marched away from Shrewsbury upon London (as we fondly hoped), we mustered upwards of ten thousand fighting men, besides a crowd of mere idlers, courtiers, and officials. I also pass over the various incidents of

our march, and arrive at once at my first battle-field. On the morning of the 23rd of October, we found ourselves descending the steep side of Edgehill, to form in the plain below, where the enemy stood ready to receive us. Hugo rode that day in Lord Bernard Stuart's Life Guards, which I had hoped would have remained in attendance on the king: but when our battle-line was forming, the life guards requested and obtained permission to charge with Rupert's corps of cavalry, to which my troop also was attached. I was not, however, destined to command it on that fatal day.—It was a soft beautiful Sabbath morning that rose over the hills and meadows of the peaceful-looking vale of Redhorse. The church-bells were pealing from the belfry of Keinton, and the sound passed solemnly over our wide-spread hosts, as they mustered for the work of slaughter. I then experienced no elation at the prospect of the approaching battle; all the high hopes and enthusiasm I had felt and cherished concerning my first fight, suddenly gave way before the solemn and saddening realities of that hour. There is something in the sight of a real enemy, almost unintelligible to a young and innocent and inexperienced mind. Men, by thousands, speaking the same language, and, in many instances, thinking the same thoughts, were there, some half-mile away, calculating how they could best destroy and crush us. Yet these men might have been good and kindly neighbours to us, as to each other, but for the one great cause; the hand and voice that was soon to deal death against his fellow-countrymen, would have offered to him kindly greetings a few months before. If such thoughts would force their way even into my boyish mind, how heavily they must have weighed on the soul of our King! And, truly, as we defiled before him to the fatal plain below, never did I see an expression of such deep and settled sorrow on the countenance of any man: a heavy gloom had fallen on it, which nothing but the brightness of his eyes relieved. There was ample time to observe him, for our whole force had but two paths to descend by from the brow of the hill, and these two met in one near where his Majesty was standing. Our column was obliged to halt just there, in order to allow the artillery to pass by; and I observed all that related to the King with the deepest interest. His thoughtful but penetrating glance seemed to scan every spot of ground, and him who occupied it, whether friend or foe: and sometimes that glance would wander for a moment to the far hill side, where the two young princes stood gazing on the scene full of such moment to their future. He scarcely looked at the different officers who came to announce information, or to require it, but he started at the sound of a deep and somewhat agitated voice, that uttered, 'God save your Majesty!' The speaker's countenance was concealed by a helmet, of which the visor was only raised as he turned to the King. I listened, however, with emotion to the voice, and felt my heart stir within me, as the King extended his hand frankly and cordially, and exclaimed, 'Lord Hastings, I hail it as a good omen for this day, that you return to my side. Nay, man, speak not of the cause that made you absent: I remember it at this hour, perhaps too

well, especially when I see yonder traitor, Holland, in the ranks of my enemies. Enough for the present, my true-hearted and gallant Hastings! if it shall please Heaven that we both survive this day, hasten to me when it is over. Now tell those troopers to move on, or the rebels will have the triumph of the first move; and there is my nephew Rupert, impatiently waving his sword below for the troops to advance.' As the King spoke the pathway had become clear. My father was instantly at my side, and an unsuppressed shout of welcome and triumph burst from his faithful followers. As we passed on to our position on the right, I had time for very few words of greeting; but my father informed me that he had travelled all night to overtake the army. He had suffered so from anxiety at home that he determined to follow us. Though still not strong, he hoped to see that one brave battle which must decide the fate of England, as he then vainly thought. Such was not the will of Providence.—But the hour of the fight was come; and so busily had I been occupied with our men, that I had scarcely time to glance along our line before the battle-smoke concealed it from my eyes. I could only observe that our force was ordered precisely in the same manner as that of our enemies; the cavalry on either wing, flanked by Aston and Heyden's artillery, and the infantry in the centre, where the stout and true Earl of Lindsey fought among his Lincoln Volunteers. I heard a few guns upon the left, then Prince Rupert rushed to the front of our column, and shouted to the trumpeters to sound a charge. Out they spoke cheerily, and all my enthusiasm blazed up again fiercely from the ashes where it had smouldered. God! what a mystery hast Thou made us! A few minutes before, at the tone of the gentle church-bells, I felt as if I could have pressed every foeman to my heart, and entreated him to change his evil ways; now, at the sound of the scornful trumpets and the glitter of the sword, my mood was changed. I thought I could have swept the enemy from the earth as the Destroying Angel of the Assyrians. I longed to gather their pikes in armfuls, like the Switzer Arnold, and defy death and suffering alike, as our Cavaliers dashed over my body through the human gap that I had made. Seldom has a thought been sooner followed by a deed. With one wild fierce shout we dashed our spurs into our horse's flanks, and as we burst upon the enemy the force of our own shock cast us asunder. The Round-head cavalry never waited for a stroke nor received one, until they were overtaken in their desperate flight; but the infantry stood firm, as Prince Rupert's columns rushed past them like a whirlwind. We on the left meanwhile were borne against Stapleton's infantry, who received us with steady hearts and levelled pikes. Still shouting 'for God and for the King!' I plunged among them, and as the weight of my gallant horse bore me through, I could feel the scratch of a dozen pikes that glanced along my armour; the next moment I was flung upon the ground, and a rush of men passing over me deprived me of all consciousness. I know not how long I lay in that sudden swoon; but as I slowly recovered I could still faintly hear the shouts and yells of desperate fight approaching and retiring, and the ground shaken under me

as masses of cavalry charged to and fro. Gradually the sounds grew more distinct, and vision returned to my eyes: I looked round, and—Heaven!—what a cruel spectacle revealed itself! The hand that I pressed on the ground to raise myself splashed in red blood, which dyed my cuirass with many a stain. Dead and mangled horses lay on either side of me, round them lay many slain and wounded men; the latter, with low moans and stifled prayers or execrations, endeavouring to writhen their gashed limbs into some less painful attitude. Most of them were enemies, but all thought of enmity seemed to have passed away. Not a few of these poor fellows had belonged to my own devoted troop, who had sealed their fidelity with their lives in endeavouring to support my charge. It was miserable to me to see those honest manly features, so well known in childhood's happier days, now distorted or pale, as the sword or musket had destroyed them. I not only knew every yeoman who lay there, but every child and village girl that vainly expected the return to his home of their slain soldier. A young trumpeter, whose first attempts to sound a horn I well remembered in our woodland chase, lay close to me, empaled by a Roundhead pike; and across his breast lay his father, his grey hairs dabbled in the blood that streamed from the boy's side. He was a sturdy forester, who taught me woodcraft long ago; his right hand still grasped the sword with which he had severed the sword that smote his son, but a small mark upon his forehead showed where a bullet had freed the childless father from all sorrow. Many such groups lay scattered widely round, formed by death and agony into terrible picturesqueness. Not one mere mercenary soldier could I see: all were honest, simple-looking countrymen, who wore their soldier garments awkwardly as they lay there, manuring their native soil with rich red blood. As my dizzy eyes wandered over the dead and dying, and slowly recognized each altered face, they were arrested by the prostrate form of an officer, whose crimson scarf showed him to be a Cavalier. I dragged myself towards where he lay upon his face, bathed in gore. I lifted him gently, raised his visor, and beheld—my father! He was not dead; but my joy on finding him alive was soon checked when I observed that indescribable pallor which, even to the inexperienced eye, is the sure sign of approaching death. Once more, however, he smiled—smiled upon me with a look of tenderest affection, and his warm heart rallied its energies again as it spoke in his kindling eye and voice. He faintly and solemnly blessed me; and through the roar of war's infernal din his whispered words fell distinctly on my ears like the accents of an angel. 'Mourn not!' he said, softly; 'no one ever so rejoiced to live as I to die—to die thus on my son's brave breast, while my King's enemies are scattered before him! Now I have no earthly fear to mingle with my hope of heaven! Long may you live, my son, loyally, righteously; and when you die, may you welcome death as I do now!' He paused, and some inarticulate words rattled in his throat; but his last heart's pulse lent vigour to his voice as he saw some of our troopers returning from the chase:

they flung themselves from their horses, and gazed with clasped hands and mournful eye upon their lord. He tried to raise himself; and, pointing with his trembling hand to where the battle was still struggling, he exclaimed, 'The standard is taken! To the rescue—to the rescue! This day or never—fight!' Then, after a moment's pause, he rose with a dying effort from my arms, and strove to utter his last war-cry. 'For God!' he cried, and his voice failed, his head sank upon his cuirass, as he murmured 'and for the King!'—and then he ceased to breathe. I felt the force of his last words, and the agony of my heart sought refuge in desperate action. I flung a fallen standard over the gallant dead, and, forgetful of all bodily pain and wounds, I sprang to my feet. My horse, fearless and well-trained, had never left me. Though rolled over and trampled on, and bleeding from a dozen wounds, he was quietly grazing on a patch of grass, from which he had pawed away the dead body of a little drummer boy. I remember nothing more of that fearful day, excepting charging across the plain, strewn as it was with parties confusedly attacking and flying. I felt my strength failing me, and I only sought to reach the first *mêlée*, to fling myself among the enemy, and perish in the clash of swords. I tried to collect myself: to take in the position of the battle, and lead my scanty troops where they were most needed, but in vain; my brain reeled, and it was only by a glimmering instinct that I led, still at a furious gallop, my willing men against the first body of orange scarfs that I could reach. My troops cheered bravely as we dashed in among the enemy, and I can remember no more."

Admirably told as is this graphic narrative, perhaps it conveys too sombre an impression, to respond to the general character of this charming work, which is replete not only with grave and serious interest, but also with amusement. Still our readers can scarcely have failed to admire with us the deep earnestness and solemn beauty of those passages referring to the Martyr-king, the zeal with which our author enters into all the fortunes of the hardy fight, and the natural and most pathetic final interview of the father and son. The nature of "Reginald Hastings," however, scarcely adapts it for extracts; it is too complete a whole. Every chapter has a fresh and living interest, and such an air of reality, that we can scarcely believe the work to be a fiction. "Reginald Hastings" is, in fine, a master-piece of its kind, and cannot fail to *live*. All the chief characters of that stormy era pass in review before us, and all enact parts which are accurately expressive of their peculiar individualities. The closing scene in the career of the young and gallant Hugo is most graphically and touchingly portrayed; and we would willingly extract it, did not time and space forbid. Then, again, the battle of Newbury is delineated with all that spirit and fire for which Mr.

Warburton's battle-scenes were ever so remarkable, softened by the influence of calm and tender Churchmanship, as, where we are told,—

“ So lay the beloved of many, the admired of all, the gallant, good Carnarvon ! And, by his side, his white hairs waving in the breeze, knelt Jeremy Taylor, the Divine, pouring forth such heavenly and consoling prayer, as brightened up the countenance of the dying man with thoughts that conquered agony.”—p. 218.

Powerfully marked is the extraordinary individuality of Hezekiah Doom, or, rather, of the regicide Felton, hovering, like an evil bird of prey, over the heroine Zillah, who, however, in her queenly grace, can scarcely be likened to the dove. The scenes betwixt her and the hero are singularly and powerfully dramatic. Few portraitures may interest the general reader more than this masterly one of Cromwell :—

“ There stood Cromwell, now not only calm, but immovable looking. I did not then note the rest of his appearance ; my whole attention was riveted on the massive but deeply-marked countenance that met mine. The bold broad brow bespoke indomitable resolution, rather than command ; the small eyes, (grey, I believe they are,) that glanced out from beneath his shaggy eye-lashes, were not what is called piercing, but they looked *inevitable*, if I may use that word to express, that it seemed impossible to baffle them. The nose was of the shape and somewhat of the colour that toppers celebrate ; but the mouth might have become Radamanthus himself. The whole visage seemed to argue a marvellous compound of subtlety and strength ; yet over all was a strange and almost noble expression of immortal sorrow ; something sublime, indeed, that fixed itself more deeply in my memory than all else.”—pp. 259, 260.

Nor is the following speech of this man's less characteristic of one of the most illustrious criminals of all time. Hastings has been brought before him, as prisoner at war, and is now awaiting his doom. Cromwell thus addresses his officers :

“ ‘ Behold ! this is the sort of man with whom we have to deal ; this is the work put upon us. Yea, here is a brave gentleman—one of good report ; honourable and just, moreover, in his generation, and well-beloved of the dwellers on his lands. One whom we have marked as not swift to shed blood, or greedy of gain, or profane, or a wine-bibber.’ He paused, and I began to feel nervous about the conclusion of this most unexpected eulogium, though I had not *then* known his panegyric, and swiftly following denunciation of the brave Lord Capel. He now looked at his officers steadily and mournfully, as if he were reading some unwelcome counsel in their countenance, as he resumed : ‘ But it is even so, my masters ; ye say, that having put his hand to the

accursed thing, he must pay the penalty thereof. It may not be that the people suffer both ways—that they be not only warred against in the field, but likewise defrauded of their righteous spoil! Is it not so, my masters? Wherefore, young man, I have sent to have speech with thee: for the Parliament is very merciful, and would not condemn any man without a hearing.’”

We break off abruptly, though the whole scene is masterly, and will well repay a reading. The perusal of this work can be compared to nothing more fitly than to a journey through a richly-wooded and highly-cultivated country, where every turning of the road presents some new and animated prospect to our eyes. As we now hastily turn the leaves, we scarcely descry a chapter on which we could not dwell with pleasure, and which would not furnish much both of interest and instruction. The scenes in Holland are particularly admirable of their kind, though they certainly do not partake of the nature of Dutch scenery; those in Switzerland are romantic, on the other hand, and exciting, as mountain scenes ought to be; and the conclusion is peculiarly appropriate and natural. Indeed, the easy grace and calm truthfulness of the work are, after all, its great and peculiar merits, which induce us to regard it as one of the most valuable illustrations of that stormy and romantic age.

We feel that in this limited notice we have neither done justice to Mr. Warburton nor to his works: we have desired only to yield our hasty tribute to his memory, as a man of the highest talents, a consistent Churchman, and an English gentleman. Others are still left behind him; the authors of “*Hochelaga*,” and “*Rollo and his Race*,” who share many of his most distinctive excellencies, and who, for his sake, will be the dearer to their country. It is no exaggeration to say, that England has seldom mourned a disaster more than the premature loss of Eliot Warburton. Men who only knew him by reputation, spoke, and still speak of him, as though he were a private and a dear friend; and the general voice appears to express, with one accord, that conviction of his sterling merits, which could scarcely find more fitting utterance, it may be, than in these well-known words:

“ His life was gentle: and the elements
So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up,
And say to all the world, This was a man!”

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

1. *The Church of Christ, in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry.* By Rev. E. Litton.
2. *Rev. A. Clissold's Spiritual Exposition of the Apocalypse.* 3. *The Church of the Invisible.* By Robert Montgomery. 4. *Hengstenberg's Revelation of St. John.* 5. *The Origin of the English, Germanic, and Scandinavian Languages and Nations.* By Rev. Dr. Bosworth. 6. *The Popes: an Historical Summary.* By G. A. F. Wilks, M.D. 7. *Mason's Pictures of Life in Mexico.* 8. *Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of the Book of Revelation?* By Dr. Wordsworth. 9. *Church Sunday School Magazine.* 10. *The Penny Post.* 11. *The Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal.* 12. *Oxford University Statutes* 13. *The Church Chronicle for the Diocese of Lichfield.* 14. *First Annual Statement of the Society for Protecting the Rights of Conscience.* 15. *Rev. W. J. E. Bennet's Pastoral Letter.* 16. *Church Extension in St. Pancras.* By W. Rivington. 17. *The Catechism of the Council of Trent.* Translated by T. A. Buckley, B.A. 18. *Rev. G. Currey's Preparation for the Gospel, as exhibited in the History of the Israelites.* 19. *Atlases for Schools.* By A. K. Johnston. 20. *The Ionian Islands.* 21. *Rev. H. Hayman's Dialogues of the Early Church.* 22. *Montgomery's Luther.* 23. *Anchurus.* By Rev. W. Ewart. 24. *A Brief Argument for reviving the Ancient Synodal Action.* By T. W. Peile, D.D. Miscellaneous.

-
- 1.—*The Church of Christ, in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry. With a particular reference to the Controversy on the subject between Romanists and ourselves.* By EDWARD ARTHUR LITTON, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. London: Longmans.

WE have received this work at so late a period, that we feel that we should do injustice to its importance and its high merits, by entering at present on the examination of the doctrines advocated in it. We can here only say, that Mr. Litton's work is one which appears calculated to throw much light on various difficult and important questions, and though we should be inclined to differ from him on various points, we yet must express the interest and instruction we have derived from this eminently suggestive work; and we hope to enter at length on the subject in our next Number.

- 11.—*The Spiritual Exposition of the Apocalypse; as derived from the Writings of the Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg, illustrated and confirmed by Ancient and Modern Authorities.* By the Rev. AUGUSTUS CLISSOLD, M.A., formerly of Exeter College, Oxford. In 4 vols. London: Longmans.

THIS is really a remarkable book in its way. It comprises a very long and very elaborate commentary on the Book of Revelation, drawn from all kinds of sources—Romish—Protestant—Dissenting—Patristic—Modern—and Mediæval. All ages and sects have been laid under contribution, for the purpose of showing the

conformity of the ablest interpreters with the views of the Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg. But it really seems to us, that such labour is in some degree thrown away, by one who professes to believe in the Divine inspiration of Swedenborg. For assuredly, if his interpretation proceeds from revelation, it is in itself quite sufficient, and cannot need the aid of the opinions of uninspired writers.

Either Swedenborg was inspired, or he was not. If he was not inspired, his interpretation must stand on its own merits; but if he was inspired, it is of very little consequence what any one else says on the subject of which he treats. The inspiration of Swedenborg, however, is the question; just as is that of Mahomet, or Joseph Smith, or Johanna Southgate, or Irving. In the Commentary before us, the Revelation is, of course, made to support the notion of the Swedenborgian or "New Jerusalem" connexion; and a great portion of the work is taken up with pointing out the supposed errors and contradictions of the Trinitarian doctrine, and in maintaining the Sabellian theories of Swedenborg. We have no doubt that it will be highly appreciated by the members of the "New Jerusalem" connexion. We are not extensively acquainted with their theological literature, but we should suppose that the work before us, from its learning and its extent, must be amongst the most important they possess. It will be read with interest by all who wish to know the system of interpretation adopted by the Swedenborgians. One characteristic of this interpretation is, that it supposes the Revelation to be a consecutive series of prophecy, proceeding in regular course, without repetition of the same events under different symbols.

III.—*The Church of the Invisible, or World of Spirits: a Manual for Christian Mourners.* By ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., Oxon, Author of "*The Christian Life*," &c. Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. London: Darling.

THIS is a well executed and carefully revised reprint of a justly popular volume. As an example of the just views which it contains, we quote the following striking passage:—

"Still we would guard you against the conclusion that any providential chastisement doth of itself absolutely and essentially incline man to repent and be renewed. Far otherwise. Afflictions, considered apart from a concurring grace to conduct and sanctify their operation unto some especial end, are rather calculated to render men morose, rebellious, and discontented, and morbidly resentful against Providence and His will. And this is often witnessed under visitations from God, so fearfully marked with the signatures of His righteous hand and wrath, one might fancy (were it possible) the very angels wonder and

weep to see men stand out with adamant sternness or infidel indifference against such an alarming appeal."

We heartily commend it to all, especially those for whom it is intended—Christian Mourners.

IV.—*The Revelation of St. John, expounded for those who search the Scriptures.* By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the original by the Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, &c. Vol. I. Edinburgh: Clark.

THIS work in exposition of the Apocalypse, is less overloaded with critical and scientific matter than is usually the case with German works. Dr. Hengstenberg is honourably known as amongst the opponents of Rationalism, and, on the whole, as one of the soundest theologians in Germany. The exposition before us evinces a great intimacy with Scripture, and we doubt not that it will be perused with interest by many readers. As far as we can see, it adopts a course of interpretation widely at variance with that which is generally received in England, and which traces the history of the Church in detail, through the successive visions of this mysterious book. The connexion of the symbols with history as described in this work, appears to be of a general, and almost vague character.

V.—*The Origin of the English, Germanic, and Scandinavian Languages, and Nations; with a Sketch of their early Literature, and short Chronological Specimens of Anglo-Saxon, Friesic, Flemish, Dutch, German from the Mæso-Goths to the present time, Icelandic, Norwegian, and Swedish; tracing the Progress of these Languages, and their Connexion with modern English, &c.* By the Rev. JOSEPH BOSWORTH, D.D., F.R.S., F.S.A., &c. London: Longmans.

To do justice to the merits of this profoundly learned and interesting work, would demand far more time and space than we can at present command. Amongst the branches of science with which we are acquainted, it appears to us that the science of Ethnology, in its more abstract forms, is inferior to none in point of difficulty. For in truth, when the origin and relations of nations are traced by the aid of their respective languages, an extent and degree of critical knowledge is requisite, which it is rare, indeed, for any man to possess; and which, in its results, is scarcely appreciable, except by its fortunate possessor. Dr. Bosworth's reputation stands high as the Author of an "Anglo-Saxon Dictionary," and the work before us appears to have been originally intended for

an Introduction to that work. It would be really impossible for us to attempt any detailed description of its contents. Suffice it to say, that the reader will here find a most elaborate dissertation on the origin and derivation of languages from the original—an account of the peopling of Europe—notices of Celtic, Germanic, and Scandinavian languages—of the various dialects of Anglo-Saxon and modern English ; and, finally, a history of all the cognate languages of the West, with illustrative Maps. In fact, the work appears to be a kind of Encyclopædia in its way.

VI.—*The Popes : an Historical Summary : comprising a period of 1784 years, from Servius to Pius IX., carefully compiled from the best Ecclesiastical Authorities, and illustrated with numerous Notes.* By G. A. F. WILKS, M.D. London : Rivingtons.

THE object of this work is to dissipate, by the force of undeniable facts, the theories of Papal infallibility and sanctity. As far as we have seen, Dr. Wilks has carried out his object with ability and success. The work is not overloaded with a cumbrous display of learning, and we should say it would be a very useful book for circulation amongst intelligent laymen.

VII.—*Pictures of Life in Mexico.* By R. H. MASON. *With Illustrations by the Author.* London : Smith, Elder, and Co., Cornhill.

WE recommend these pleasant volumes for an idle hour's reading. " Pictures " they are, as their name imports ; or rather bird's-eye views of life in Mexico,—that land so highly favoured in its climate and productions, where animal and vegetable nature put on their most gorgeous attire, and where moral nature sinks to such hideous degradation. The contrast is striking indeed to behold such magnificent and lovely scenery—snowy mountains and smiling plains, forests of noble trees, tangled and trellised with masses of brilliant flowers, and alive with birds of dazzling plumage, and snakes of still more lovely hues ; sparkling veins of metal and precious stones bursting through the soil ; cities of splendour, noble even in their decay,—and then to turn from these to the squalid and miserable Indians, to the wretched and filthy *léperos*, the swarms of degraded ruffians, begging, robbing, and murdering, by day and by night, in the public streets, and the hordes of *ladrones*, or mounted robbers, who infest the country roads.

The chief occupation of all classes appears to be gambling—beyond almost any other country—here ; even the vilest of the *léperos* have their own gaming-houses ; while, until a very few

years ago, education was at so low an ebb that it was estimated not more than one in fourteen of the inhabitants of Mexico could read. The separation of the sexes in the middle class—the men and women seldom taking their meals in the same apartment—tends to degrade both; and even in the higher class there is a total want of the social intercourse, in which alone civilization and domestic happiness can advance.

Probably no country in the world can exhibit a lower or more repulsive system of religion than Mexico; the “padres” having unbounded sway over every class, and being themselves, not merely entirely uneducated, but so devoid of morality, as scarcely to attempt the assumption of a better character. Their power may be judged of in some degree by the enormous wealth of the Mexican Church. Mr. Mason says:—

“It is difficult to name with exactness the sum of its revenues, there being no statistic information on the subject; but it is not too much to estimate the worth of Church property in Mexico—consisting of houses, convents, churches, furniture, jewels, and gold and silver vessels—at the sum of a hundred and sixty millions of dollars; exclusive of the annual incomes derived by the priests, hierarchy, and secular clergy from their flocks. The bishops and superior clergy are as numerous as they were before the Revolution. Besides an archbishop and nine bishops, there are nearly five thousand parish priests. There are ten cathedrals, with canons, and other dignitaries innumerable; and more than a hundred and fifty convents, containing nearly two thousand monks. The priests and monks have the sole distribution of all monies bequeathed for pious and charitable purposes; and Church property is still exempt, as it was before the Revolution, from paying any tax or burden whatever to the state. The Jesuits were driven from the country, and their estates confiscated, when the yoke of the Spaniards was shaken off.”—Vol. i. pp. 119, 120.

For a description of the interior of these splendid cathedrals—blazing with jewels and gold—we must refer our readers to Mr. Mason’s lively pages—but we cheerfully extract the following curious history:—

“During the troublous and sanguinary times that preceded the first Congress of the Republic in 1825, it was judged expedient by the authorities of a distant provincial cathedral, that the gold and silver utensils and ornaments, with the precious stones and other costly movables, should be removed, for greater safety, to another church in the interior of the country. To this end, boxes and hampers, with false slides and secret contrivances, were made; so that, in the event of their capture or examination by robbers, the most valuable articles might remain undiscovered. The treasures were packed with the utmost care and secrecy; and much deliberation was exercised in the choice of an

escort to accompany the precious cargo. At length it was decided that one Tezarín—a worthy disciple of the Church, who had been employed to command an escort under government—and his band, with several holy brethren from the cathedral, should be entrusted with the duty.

“The caravan set out in due time upon their journey, with the utmost caution and privacy: the treasure being disguised under the appearance of a common bale of merchandise; and its guardians wearing the semblance of merchants with their escort. They proceeded for a considerable distance in security; but on the evening of the second day of their journey, much to their surprise, the party were assailed by a determined band of ladrones; they were disarmed, and their luggage was carefully examined. Not content with merely surveying the packages, however, the robbers, as if by a strange instinct, broke the boxes to pieces, and thus the hidden gems and most costly vessels were exposed to view. Every thing was ruthlessly carried away; the prisoners were left behind, bound hand and foot, and the robbers made good their escape, leaving no traces whatever of their flight.

“For a long period the secret of this daring and successful sacrilege continued an impenetrable mystery. The chagrined priests left no method untried for the discovery of the plunderers and their booty, and to learn how their secret expedition had transpired (for it was evident that the thieves had been supplied with previous information); but all their efforts and inquiries were entirely unavailing. At length the immaculate Tezarín himself was apprehended, and condemned upon a charge of theft and conspiracy; and while under sentence of death for these misdemeanours, he confessed, among other revelations, that the unaccountable robbery of the treasures of the church, just recorded, had been executed under his own direction. He admitted that the time and place of the occurrence had been planned by him; though he had submitted, for obvious reasons, to be bound as a prisoner with the rest. He also gave such information as led to the apprehension and execution of his accomplices. The punishment of Tezarín was mitigated, and the principal treasures of the cathedral were, by his agency, recovered: but their history does not end here.

“Although the jewels and golden vessels were restored to their old places in the cathedral, outbreaks and disturbances in its neighbourhood were of frequent occurrence. The hearts of the holy fathers were once more filled with doubts and fears; and so bitterly had they earned the experience of the past, that they had scarcely now the confidence to trust one another. While affairs were in this situation, news came that a church at no great distance from their own had been entered and plundered of its richest treasures, and that a series of such robberies was to be apprehended. This report, which they had every reason to fear was but too correct, had the effect of greatly increasing the consternation of the priests.

“The superior ecclesiastic and two of his favourites had come to the determination, without the knowledge of the brethren, that a subterranean vault should be formed under a particular part of the cathedral, where, in time of need, the most valuable of the church’s possessions

might be deposited. With much ingenuity the desired receptacle was stealthily completed, and the entrance preserved a profound secret among the worthy trio. They had decided that the only means of access should be by a trap-door from above, closed with an invisible spring; and the trap-door was cunningly fixed, and the imperceptible spring duly set, accordingly.

“The disturbances in the vicinity increased. Insurrection followed insurrection; outrage succeeded outrage; pillage appeared to become the order of the day. Neither life nor property was held sacred; and the cathedral itself was threatened with an invasion.

“‘We must watch vigilantly and incessantly, from night to morning, each in his turn,’ exclaimed the affrighted dignitary to his companions; ‘for we know not at what hour the peace of our Zion may be threatened by these sacrilegious depredators.’

“And watch they did, night and morning, in parties, in obedience to the orders of their chief.

“Many a dire alarm shook the hearts of those devoted old priests as they performed their tedious duty, through the midnight hours, under the arches and vaulted roofs of the old cathedral. Often did they give themselves up for lost when the echo of footsteps near the square, or the noise of the wind as it shook the fretted doors of the building, saluted their listening ears. The murmur of the breeze, as it swept through the deserted aisles; the wanderings of the rats beneath the hollow wainscotings; or the crackling sound of some expiring taper as it sank into its socket,—vibrated upon their overstrained nerves like the rush of a throng of *léperos*, or the coming tramp of a band of mounted *ladrones*. Even their own voices, and the echo of their footsteps, became strange to them as they cowered together, and gazed from time to time into each other’s haggard and anxious faces. The anxiety and dread at last had the effect of imparting an unearthly tinge to their aspects; and they seemed, even to one another, to resemble those departed spirits who are doomed to keep a gloomy vigil through the hours of darkness, beside the well-remembered scenes of their misfortunes or their crimes. At length at a late hour, one stormy night, when the three ecclesiastics, to whom alone the secret of the vault was known, happened to be on the watch together, a sound as of a thronging multitude arose in the distance, which, as it drew nearer, was heard above the howling of the wind and the falling of the rain. The tramp of heavy footsteps approached the cathedral; shouts and vociferous cries burst forth on every side; the red glare of innumerable torches shone through the emblazoned window. At the first alarm, the trio of monks proceeded to carry the portable boxes containing their choicest treasures into the vault below; and by the time the building was surrounded, they had concealed the whole.

“Meantime a series of thundering knocks assailed the door, which it was evident must soon give way beneath the repeated strokes: the massive bolts were forced, the hinges torn away, and an entrance effected. Just as the band of depredators rushed madly through the opening, the shaven head of the last of the three priests disappeared

below the entrance of the vault ; the trap-door was hastily closed, and the spring was made secure.

“ But this movement had not escaped the searching eye of a lépero in the crowd.

“ The cathedral was thoroughly ransacked ; many valuable articles were broken to pieces, and the fragments were passed from hand to hand ; but a murmur of disappointment arose, ere long, that so few available treasures were to be discovered. The idea of a subterranean concealment at once flashed upon the minds of the robbers, and the supposition was confirmed by the lépero who had seen the closing trap-door. They immediately tried every crevice and broken stone, and beat violently on the floor with hammers and axes ; but so well had the opening been concealed, that they were compelled to abandon the attempt in despair. Venting their disappointment upon the building, they demolished several of the painted windows, and carried off the choicest of the ornaments ; and it was a miracle the edifice escaped conflagration at their hands.

“ The beating upon the floor, however, had broken the spring of the trap-door, the holy fathers' only avenue of escape ; and when, on the disappearance of the invading crowd, they attempted to emerge, they found themselves, in spite of every effort, hopelessly immured in a dungeon that must soon prove their living sepulchre !

“ The remains of the three monks were only discovered—fast beside the treasures which in life they had loved so well—when the marble floor was taken up by some workmen who were engaged in the restoration of the dilapidated and desecrated cathedral.”—Vol. i. pp. 137—144.

An awful “ Picture ” of Mr. Mason portrays the Acordada, or prison of Mexico, too revolting for extract. For the morals of the lower classes, let the fact suffice that, “ out of a population little over 130,000, the prisoners in one average year amounted to 9237 ; ” and of these, 58 were committed for vitriol-throwing,—a crime which may well be called of “ fiendish atrocity.”—Vol. i. p. 193.

Amidst so much that is dark and disgusting, it is pleasant to find a bright spot in the picture portraying the poor but faithful *arrieros*, or carriers, who appear to be almost the only honest and trustworthy people in the country : to them is entrusted the transmission of all small merchandise, and in some parts even they only travel in companies. Uncomplaining and enduring as the patient mule he drives, the *arriero* toils on, through *tierras calientes* and *tierras frias*, through dark forests and over frightful precipices, along mountain passes and solitary places, meeting at every step a white cross, marking the murdered remains of some less fortunate *arriero*, overtaken by *ladrones*. One of their adventures may amuse our readers :—

“ One bright summer morning an *arriero* set out from the city of Chihuahua with an unusually precious cargo on the back of his mule,

including a small quantity of coin and several bars of silver. Considerable precautions had been taken by his employer; and, as secrecy and dispatch were necessary in the transmission, he commenced his journey privately, under the impression that his errand and destination were unknown to his acquaintances and comrades.

"At the end of the first day, though the road had been rocky and difficult, his progress was considerable; for his spirits were buoyant, his mule was hardy and active, and the strength of both was yet unwearied. He stopped in the evening at a little *rancho* which was well known to him: it contained but two rooms, and was the only place where it was possible to obtain shelter for many miles. Its owner was an old, solitary Indian, who received him on this occasion with unwonted hospitality; and, after partaking of a hasty meal of *chilé* and *frijoles*, by a wood fire on the ground, in the company of the host, and, making fast the bridle of his mule to the wall of his own apartment, he retired to his couch, composed of two skins and a blanket, to enjoy a night's repose.

"After more than an hour of wakefulness, he was startled by hearing his own name spoken in subdued tones by more than one person in the next room, where the fire was still burning brightly! Applying his eyes to a crevice in the partition dividing the two apartments, he perceived that the adjoining chamber was occupied by three figures besides the old Indian host; and overheard them planning the readiest way to rob and murder him. The unexpected guests were *léperos*, whom he remembered to have seen in the city of Chihuahua, and they must have patiently tracked his footsteps at a distance during the day's journey.

"The *arriero* was well armed, it is true; but resistance against such fearful odds was perfectly out of the question. The only door of his sleeping-place led to the scene of consultation, and it had been secured on the other side; window there was none, and the least noise might be fatal to him. There appeared no means of escape, and time pressed; for it was not likely that the attack of his enemies would be much longer delayed. With the energy of coming despair, he cast his eyes round the room, and to his great joy perceived a slight opening in the thatch that composed the roof. Repressing an exclamation that sprang to his lips, he mounted the slight pile of skins that had composed his pillow, and nervously thrust his hand into the cavity; the thatch yielded to his touch, for it was a mere mixture of reeds and rushes. He breathed more freely, for his escape seemed no longer impossible; but then there were his mule and his treasure. Well! first securing his own safety, he would put a plan in execution, which hastily crossed his mind, for the recovery of his baggage.

"With the utmost caution, he removed the accumulation of soft and decayed matter from the lower part of the roof; then, after examining his weapons, he noiselessly sprang upwards with all his strength, gained the top of the mud and *adobé* wall, and dropped down on the outside. Taking advantage of the darkness, he then carefully proceeded by the side of the rocks to a spot with which he was well acquainted, where

several paths met, at some distance on the right of the inhospitable hut. Here he paused, and, taking a pistol from his belt, fired it without more ado into the air; trusting to attract the attention of his assailants, and to draw them from the hut. Nor was he mistaken in his calculation; for, ere he had time to regain the rancho by a circuitous route, he had the satisfaction of seeing what he believed to be the whole party scouring the several paths in the distance, to ascertain the cause of such an unlooked-for disturbance of their plans.

“On entering the hut, he found that the old Indian had been left behind to guard the supposed prisoner and his property; but this was only a momentary obstruction to his progress. With the speed of lightning he threw himself upon the cowering wretch; and, placing one hand on his mouth to stifle his outcries, plunged his cuchillo twice up to the hilt in his back, between the shoulders. Then casting a heap of mats upon the fire to extinguish it, that the ruffians might not have the advantage of its light to guide them back, he unloosed his trusty mule from the wall, and, emerging from the hut, drove the animal before him by a track which he had every reason to believe was but little known.

“His superior knowledge of the country enabled him, even in the darkness, to make good way from the scene of his past peril; and he used every exertion to place as great a distance as possible between his outwitted enemies and himself. On he sped, beside his patient mule, over the mountain paths in the dead of the night; the man profiting in no slight degree by the fine instinct of the animal, who seemed to understand the emergency, and to strain every limb for the preservation of his master. But even sure-footed mules have occasionally been known to take a false step, and our arriero's beast stumbled over a projecting rock, and fell down a shallow precipice, carrying his master with him. Though the declivity was slight, the fall was yet so heavy that both arriero and mule lay at the bottom stunned and insensible for hours. As it chanced, however, this fall proved the means of their preservation: two of their ruthless and determined enemies had been upon their track, having heard the steps of the mule from a distance; and but for this accident the arriero would have been overtaken.

“But their pursuers passed on in the darkness, and returned ere long, under the impression that they had been deceived. The light of morning discovered the arriero and his mule waking and stretching themselves, somewhat bruised, but with no bones broken.

“Grateful for his late escape, our muleteer pressed on with fresh vigour, long and toilsome though the stages were, till he arrived in the neighbourhood of the Mexican mountains; then he began to calculate the time when he might expect to arrive at his wished-for destination in the capital.

“For a considerable distance that mountain-path abounds in intricate windings, which render it impossible for the wayfarer to perceive the road very far, either before or behind him. Glancing backwards over his shoulder at one of these points, our arriero perceived a whole herd

of wild and heavily-armed men hastily approaching. A moment's consideration convinced him that these were ladrones; and their quick movements and threatening gestures sufficiently testified their hostile intention toward himself. On they came with cries and imprecations, calling upon him to stop, if he had no wish to find himself at the bottom of the nearest precipice, with a dozen rifle-balls lodged underneath his jerkin.

"The arriero's ingenuity and presence of mind here again served him in good stead. Instead of flying from them, or betraying the least fear on their approach, he turned towards the band with a placid countenance, and held up his hands to intimate his satisfaction. He then gave them to understand that he had been anxiously awaiting the arrival of the troop, and would be gratified to share with them the treasures in his possession; that he admired the wild life of the freebooters, and wished of all things to be admitted into the band.

"The bait was swallowed with avidity; the arriero was joyfully accepted as a comrade, and his treasure was hailed as an acquisition to their stores. It was decided, after an animated debate, that the money, being portable, should be placed in the captain's care, for the instant requirements of the troop; but that the bars of silver, being heavy, should remain upon the back of the mule until the next day, when they would make arrangements for exchanging them for coin. Then the whole company, elated with the success of their enterprise, proceeded with their new comrade to a secret resort among the mountains, where they passed a night of boisterous carousing, singing, swearing, and quarrelling, as is usual in such scenes of drunkenness and debauchery.

"Every member of the band, excepting our brave arriero, fell at length into a state of sodden slumber; he had anticipated such a result, and hastened to take advantage of it: stealthily relieving the captain of the money he had appropriated, he quickly led away his trusty and still laden mule from the inner cave, and before the dawn of day, was far beyond pursuit. The arriero, ultimately overcoming all difficulties and temptations, landed his precious cargo in safety at its anticipated resting-place."—Vol. ii. pp. 9—17.

Among such a people, and in such a country, where nature has done every thing and man nothing, agriculture is, of course, in the most primitive state; the natural fertility of the soil, producing in many parts two or three crops of Indian corn and wheat in one year, and the physical debility of the Indian adding to his indolence and sluggishness. Melancholy, indeed, it is, to look at the helpless and degraded state of the Indian labourer, or rather slave, of the present day—at the decreasing commerce of the country—the financial difficulties of the government—the revolutionary troubles and continual sanguinary revolts, or *pronunciamientos*, in every town and village—the lawlessness, suffering, and degradation existing every where: and remembering that these

people are *nominally Christian*, look back upon the thousands of giant temples of Aztec worship in ancient times—founded in horror and bathed in human blood, it is true, but so magnificent in size, in wealth, in splendour, and beauty of workmanship, that no eye will ever behold them, even in their decay and ruin, without being oppressed with the shadow of a mighty people, who have passed away for ever.

We would fain have found room for many more amusing and lively “Pictures,” but we can only advise our readers to seek them for themselves, along with much information, which appears to have been put together with equal care and industry: we have space, before we bid Mr. Mason farewell, but for one more adventure, in company with one of the wild-cattle hunters of the prairie.

“The Red point was the name given to a spot where the soil was of an extremely ruddy colour; and as the sun now cast its last burning rays upon the earth, the glowing appearance was heightened, insomuch that it might have been mistaken at first sight for a sheet of water reflecting the gorgeous atmosphere above. Our traveller gazed for a little while on the scene before him; not that he could appreciate its beauty, but he was endeavouring to calculate by its aspect the degree of to-morrow’s heat. He then slowly turned his eyes in the direction of the east, then towards the north, then towards the west again, taking in every object between himself and the horizon in his range. Apparently satisfied with his observations, he walked his horse to a slight hollow at a little distance, containing three trees, and tied the animal to the trunk of one of them; then, as the darkness came on, he proceeded to select a grassy nook within a few paces of the tree, and after refreshing himself and horse, laid him down to rest. Deep sleep overtook him as the stars above appeared in their accustomed places; and the scene, which had lately been so glaring, became enwrapped in the cool and quiet lustre of a tropical night.

“He slept soundly for several hours, dreaming about his home in the village, and the expectant wife he had left behind. Next his thoughts recurred to Yio, the dealer, to whom he had promised a goodly number of hides within the space of two days. Then he dreamed of the priestly father, of whom he had a great dread, and of his parting benediction on his journey; he thought, in his vision, that the priest was before him, and gazed upon him; that as he gazed, his aspect changed, and he regarded him with the most dreadful sternness, accusing him of forgetting his evening prayers and aves before lying down to sleep upon that spot. The priest’s aspect grew more and more severe; his countenance became more terrible, and his voice louder and harsher than before; finally, he stood over him and cursed him with loud and dreadful imprecations, and forthwith consigned him to the torments of purgatory in retribution. Yes, he felt that he was there; there, among the

unhappy spirits, suffering the extremity of torture! And, oh! the awful groans and howls of anguish that resounded through that dreadful place! How the wretched spirits ground their teeth in rage and despair; and shrieked and tore themselves in agony, as they leaped and sprang out of the circling flames, crackling and hissing around! Now a troop of fiends surround him, and he feels the burning heat has seized upon him! They take and thrust him among the fiercest of the fires; and—

“Suddenly he awoke with a start and shudder; his person and clothes bathed in perspiration, which fell from him like huge drops of rain. The stars were shining calmly above him, but the dreadful sounds of which he had been dreaming still seemed to salute his waking ears. Yells and shrieks, howlings and groanings, sounded close beside him, thrilling through every nerve; and still they ceased not. Presently he heard a sound which recalled his scattered senses.

“It was his horse in the midst of a pack of wolves!

“It was too late to save him. The wolves, pinched with hunger, are unusually daring at night. There is a numerous herd of them, and they are quarrelling together over every morsel of the spoil; for there is not sufficient to satisfy the whole. Several of them have turned away, with their hunger sharpened, and approach the hunter, while their companions are battling for the horse's bones. Meanwhile he has started up, seized his double-barrelled rifle, the only weapon, beside his lasso, which he has brought with him, determining to hold out as long as possible, and to sell his life as dearly as he can.

“The wolves now surround him as he stands, but hesitate in advancing to the attack. This race of wolves are in the habit of retreating from the presence of men, unless in extreme want: but now it is night; they are in great numbers; their appetite has been stimulated by the taste of blood; there is but one man, and they come nearer. So closely they approach at last, that he can perceive the starlight reflected brightly, though in a warmer tint, from their eyeballs; while the vapour of their breath envelopes him. Animated by a sudden and almost despairing impulse, he levels his piece at the nearest group, and fires. One of the wolves lies dead, another is wounded, and the rest retreat to a little distance in alarm.

“It is not for long, however; they perceive that nothing follows, and very soon return. They approach him, and close round him again; his position is critical. They come nearer still. But a slight diversion in his favour occurs from their summarily falling upon their comrades who have just been shot, and devouring them with savage eagerness. This second course produces almost as much confusion as did the first; under cover of which the watchful hunter attempts to retreat slowly and carefully from their immediate neighbourhood.

“Soon they follow him once more; and every barrier between him and a dreadful death seems removed. Still he retreats slowly and half unconsciously; they are very near him now. Now one has leaped upon him; and the remaining barrel of his rifle has exploded in the struggle. Fortunately it has shot the wolf in question; the rest fall

back in affright and devour their dead companion as before. If he can only gain the deep stream which he sees shining on his right hand, the hunter will have a chance of safety; the water will, at all events, be an auxiliary to him, as he is an excellent swimmer. The thought inspires him with renewed hope and energy; he halloos and beats off his enemies at every step; and after many narrow escapes, he reaches the bank of the river. The wolves, however, appear to have a perception of the importance of the moment; and just as he is about to plunge into the stream, they make one fierce, simultaneous rush upon him.

“For an instant nothing can be discerned but foam and splashes, as the water is divided both by the assailants and the assailed. The hunter, diving beneath the surface, has almost placed himself beyond reach of the wolves, whilst many of their bodies float around him drowned. He is beginning to congratulate himself on his deliverance, as he perceives his enemies yelling and gnashing their teeth together on the opposite bank, when he feels himself seized by two animals of a larger and stronger growth than the rest. Their teeth almost meet in his flesh, and, in spite of his utmost exertions to the contrary, they are gradually drawing him under water. In vain he grasps their throats with maniac energy; still they keep their hold, and the stream becomes dyed with his blood. Presently the smaller of the two looses his hold; the current carries him away, and he is drowned. Only one of his assailants, a large she-wolf, remains to be dealt with now. He struggles desperately, but in vain, to free himself from her grasp; yet he perceives a kind of fixedness in her movements that he had not observed before. Stretching out his arm once more, he places his hand upon her head and mouth, and finds that she is dead. Still her weight draws him downwards; almost immediately he feels a faintness creep over him; he loses his consciousness; and with the gripe of the dead wolf still fixed firmly upon him, he sinks below the surface of the water. But in the act of sinking, the bodies of the hunter and his enemy cleaving the stream violently, the hold of the beast became relaxed. The man rose to the surface, and his head coming in contact with a sharp projecting rock, his consciousness returned. He opened his eyes, forthwith struggled to the bank, and in great weakness and exhaustion, succeeded in climbing upon it. As the first rays of the quiet morning light broke in the distance, the full particulars of his past peril flashed upon his mind; he turned and beheld the last group of his assailants retreating in the opposite direction, and folding his hands upon his breast, he gave hearty thanks to Heaven for his deliverance.”—Vol. ii. pp. 113—120.

We must not forget to mention the spirited etchings which adorn Mr. Mason's volumes.

VIII. *Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of the Book of Revelation? An Essay derived in part from the Author's Lectures on the Apocalypse, and partly from other sources.* By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. London: Rivingtons. 1851.

THIS invaluable little Essay, sold for one shilling, should command a circulation of hundreds of thousands. To every honest mind the argument put forward in it, we should say, must carry conviction; it is at once learned and eloquent, and truly incapable of refutation. We extract a noble passage:—

“ Nearly eighteen centuries have now passed away, since the Holy Spirit prophesied, by the mouth of St. John, that this Mystery would be revealed in that City, which was then the Queen of the Earth, the City on Seven Hills, the City of Rome. The Mystery was then dark, dark as midnight. Man's eye could not pierce the gloom. The fulfilment of the prophecy seemed improbable,—almost impossible. Age after age rolled away. By degrees, the mist which hung over it became less thick. The clouds began to break. Some features of the dark Mystery began to appear, dimly at first, then more clearly, like mountains at daybreak. Then the form of the Mystery became more and more distinct. The Seven Hills, and the Woman sitting upon them, became visible. Her voice was heard. Strange sounds of blasphemy were uttered by her. Then they became louder and louder. And the golden chalice in her hand, her scarlet attire, her pearls and jewels, glittered in the sun; kings and nations were seen prostrate at her feet, and drinking her cup. Saints were slain by her power. And now the prophecy became clear, clear as noon-day; and we tremble with awe at the sight, while we read the inscription, emblazoned in large letters, ‘ Mystery, Babylon the Great,’ written by the hand of St. John, guided by the Spirit of God, on the forehead of the Church of Rome!”

IX.—*Church Sunday School Magazine.* 1851. Vol. VI. London: Rivingtons. [18mo. pp. 280.]

A VERY pleasing and useful little publication. The variety of its materials, and the good sense and piety characterizing the whole, combined with its very low price, must ensure an extensive circulation; and we cordially wish it all success.

X.—*The Penny Post.* Vol. I. January to December. 1851. London: J. H. Parker.

THIS cheap and well-written periodical represents the views of a considerable class of persons, who may generally be characterized

as disciples of the Tractarian school. It is carefully edited, and we should think it would prove an efficient organ for the promotion of the class of views which it advocates.

XI.—*The Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal. Vol. I. From January to December. 1851. Edinburgh: Grant and Son.*

WE have watched with much interest and cordial good wishes the course of the “*Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*” during the first year of its existence; and we have at its conclusion to congratulate the Scottish Church on the establishment of a journal which is distinguished as much by the ability with which it is conducted, as by the tone of sound and moderate Churchmanship which it has maintained, amidst the strife of extreme opinions. We trust that it will meet support in this course from all that portion of the Church which is willing to act for the general good, irrespective of party considerations.

XII.—*Oxford University Statutes. Translated to 1843 by the late G. R. M. WARD, Esq., M.A., &c., and completed under the superintendence of JAMES HEYWOOD, Esq., M.P., F.R.S. Vol. II. London: Pickering.*

THE publication before us contains much valuable matter illustrative of the history of the University of Oxford. We have nothing to do with the motives of those who have published it—the principles and intentions of Mr. Heywood are sufficiently well known. In the Appendix, there are various documents relative to the Tractarian movement.

XIII.—*The Church Chronicle for the Diocese of Lichfield. Nos. 1, 2, 3. Printed and published (for the Proprietor) by James Pyson Nibbs, Printer, at the “Edensor Press,” in the parish of Edensor, in the county of Derby.*

HERE, indeed, is a journal to which we most earnestly wish success, and which will obtain it, if a large and enlightened zeal for the truth as taught in the Church of England, and a judicious selection of the most popular and useful topics, constitute any claim on support. This “*Church Chronicle*” cannot fail to encourage all that is good in the Diocese of Lichfield, and to promote vital religion and sound faith wherever it is circulated. It is published monthly, price one penny; and it is admirably calculated for circulation amongst the middling and lower orders. We are in great want of penny publications of this kind.

XIV.—*First Annual Statement of the Society for Protecting the Rights of Conscience.* Dublin: Webb and Chapman.

It is amongst the signs of the times that it has been found requisite to establish a Society in Ireland for the express purpose of holding out protection to converts against the persecution of the Romanists; and it is very cheering to see men of all parties engaged in this truly charitable and Christian work. The funds are raised by subscription, and are generally applied in enabling persons to give some temporary employment to converts, who are almost invariably thrown out of work by joining the Church in Ireland. The Roman Catholic farmers and employers dismiss them immediately on discovering the fact; and numbers are obliged to fly from home, in order to obtain the means of living. There are many affecting details in this Report of the sufferings of these people in the cause of God. The Report is valuable in another respect, as showing the *extent* of the movement in all parts of Ireland, the readiness with which the people receive the Word of God, and the constancy with which they adhere to it. We would express an earnest hope that all of our readers who are interested in the advance of the Reformation in Ireland will get this Report, and aid the Society (the funds of which are very inadequate to its object) with their subscriptions. The office of the Society is at 133, Stephen's Green, Dublin. The Archbishop of Dublin is the President.

XV.—*A Pastoral Letter to the Parishioners of Frome, in the Diocese of Bath and Wells.* By the Rev. W. J. E. BENNET, M.A., Vicar. London: Masters.

THIS Letter is not such a production as we should have wished to see. We had indulged a faint hope, that, after all that has occurred, and on calmer consideration, the author might have been able to draw back in some degree from the position assumed by him while at St. Barnabas, and might have afforded to his well-wishers some security for greater moderation in future, by some acknowledgment that he was not inclined to adhere to all his previous expressions and acts. In this, it is needless to say, we have been disappointed. The author represents himself as a persecuted man, most unjustly treated; and while acknowledging himself fallible, he yet vindicates all his actual proceedings and his language, and while holding out a plain intimation that the same course, in respect of ceremonial, will be pursued at Frome which has caused offence elsewhere, urges patience, good will, and forbearance on the part of his parishioners, and exhorts them to

follow his guidance. We sincerely trust that all will be overruled for good, but we regret the general tone and character of this Letter, and lament that such an opportunity has been lost.

xvi.—*Church Extension in St. Pancras. A Comparative Statement of the Increase of Houses, &c., in the Parish of St. Pancras, Middlesex, from 1801 to 1851; with a Brief Summary of the Measures taken and in progress to provide for the Spiritual Wants of the Parish.* By WILLIAM RIVINGTON. London: Rivingtons.

A PUBLICATION like that before us, portrays a state of things which cannot be described by any other terms than that of "awful." Here is a single parish, the population of which has, within fifty years, risen from 30,000 to 170,000, and which, during almost all that time, has been comparatively destitute of the commonest outward means of grace. The present vicar, Mr. Dale, on his accession to the living in 1847, having been previously made Canon of St. Paul's by Sir Robert Peel—an appointment which reflects honour on that minister—found the parish of St. Pancras in such a state of spiritual destitution as well might make him tremble. But he girded himself to his work manfully; and notwithstanding much direct and indirect opposition, he has succeeded in advancing the cause of religion to a very great and cheering extent. We like to see such things as temporary churches and temporary ministers in such cases. We like to see the missionary system brought into play where it is really called for. Time was when our ancestors worshipped in churches made of wattles; and many is the place now where a wattled and thatched, or wooden, ay, or earthen, church is grievously wanted. Mr. Rivington has produced one of the most interesting and valuable pamphlets we have seen for a long time on matters connected with Church Extension. As a detailed record of the progress of the Church in a vast London parish, it is most instructive and interesting. But the remark remains to be made, that the mere outward and material provision for Church Extension is *something* indeed; but it is little, unless you can find men of a truly missionary spirit prepared to go into the waste places, and re-gather into the fold of Christ the depraved and irreligious multitudes around them. It is not mere outward organization or system of any kind that can do the real work.

XVII.—*The Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated into English; with Notes by THEODORE ALOIS BUCKLEY, B.A., &c.* London: Routledge.

A USEFUL volume to those who are engaged in studies on the Romish controversy. It appears to be executed well and carefully.

XVIII.—*The Preparation for the Gospel, as exhibited in the History of the Israelites. The Hulsean Lectures, preached before the University of Cambridge, in 1851. By GEORGE CURREY, B.D., &c.* Cambridge: Deighton. London: Rivingtons.

THE object of this able and learned series of Lectures is to show how the history of the Israelites led in a harmonious succession to the establishment of Christianity, with an especial view to infidel objections. The train of Scriptural illustration, through which the author is led, in tracing the analogies, identities, and developments connected with his subject, is highly instructive and edifying; and his work must be regarded as a valuable accession to our theological literature.

XIX.—1. *A School Atlas of General and Descriptive Geography, &c.* By ALEX. KEITH JOHNSTON, F.R.S.E., &c. Edinburgh and London: Blackwoods.

2. *A School Atlas of Physical Geography, &c.* By ALEX. KEITH JOHNSTON. Blackwoods.

THESE Atlases are not only deserving of the attention of all who are engaged in the work of Education, but of all that class who wish to possess convenient and portable atlases, at a moderate price. The Atlas of General and Descriptive Geography not only comprises all the latest discoveries, and includes all the modern geographical divisions and boundaries of states; but it is remarkable for its distinctness and accuracy; and the system of colouring adopted is the best we have seen, with a view to the discrimination of one territory from another. The Atlas of Physical Geography contains charts of the ocean currents—principal lakes—river systems—mountains, table-lands, and valleys—distribution of earthquakes and volcanoes—temperature—constant and periodical winds—distribution of rain and snow—distribution of vegetable and animal life, and of the different races and religions of men. We can recommend this Atlas, as comprising a vast amount of most interesting and important information. The

results of immense labour, and of the most profound observations of scientific men, are here brought together in a shape and form which render them accessible to all moderately-educated persons.

xx.—*The Ionian Islands ; what they have lost and suffered, &c.*
By an IONIAN. London : Ridgway.

THIS pamphlet contains a strong attack upon the government and policy of the Lord Commissioner of the Ionian Islands. It is written with great energy and ardour. The eminent personages who figure in an introductory Letter as Σὶρ Ε. Γ. Οὐαρδος, and τοῦ Λόρδ Γρέϋ, and Κύριος Ι. Γϋουμ, will be long remembered in the Ionian Islands.

xxi.—*Dialogues of the Early Church*: I. Rome. II. Smyrna. III. Carthage. By HENRY HAYMAN, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford. London : Skeffington and Southwell.

THE author of these Dialogues has composed a series of Dialogues which are framed almost exactly on the model of those which one might suppose to have been written in the third century. He has entered thoroughly into the spirit of his subject—the persecutions of the Early Christians.

xxii.—*Luther : or, Rome and the Reformation.* By ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., Author of "*The Christian Life*," "*God and Man*," &c. Sixth Edition, revised and enlarged. London : Blackwood, Paternoster-row. 1852.

ANOTHER, and another, and another edition of Mr. Montgomery's poems, is called for by the reading public, and yet we are assured by critics, by publishers, nay, by all the world, that there is no longer any demand for poetry in England. It is manifest that this impression, however general, is not a correct one, for facts go further than ten thousand arguments drawn from the work-a-day objects of men's thoughts and interests, and the utilitarian character of the century. Tennyson's fame is great in the critical world, and most justly so ; we esteem him one of the most exquisite of lyric poets. But Robert Montgomery has, at least, ten readers where he has one ; and, this being the case, the bard of "*Luther*" can afford to smile at the assaults and denunciations of his adversaries. The fact is, that his poetry represents many of the most familiar, and at the same time the most healthful tendencies of the English national mind ; and thence, doubtless, his great success with the general public.

His vigour of thought is, perhaps, his most marked characteristic, and no where is this more happily exhibited than in his poem of "Luther," the sixth edition of which now lies before us. It is replete with vigorous reasoning, and characterized by what we may call a certain point of beauty, and a stately magnificence of verse in those passages in which the beauties of nature are portrayed, or the faith and honour of the great Reformer are vindicated. Mr. Montgomery has added, we perceive, a new section to this poem, on "Jesuits and the Mind of Man," which is exceedingly characteristic of its author's power, and with the main bearings of which we most heartily concur. In conclusion, we will cite one powerful passage from "the Poet's Retrospect," which we only cull from amongst a thousand equally, or more powerful passages, because it happened to arrest our attention first, and which may help our readers to account for Mr. Montgomery's extensive popularity. He is speaking with reference to the Christian Sabbath :—

"Glory, to think that on this morn, mankind
Bow at the footstool of their common Sire
In co-equality of dust and sin,
To plead for mercy at salvation's fount.
Ye mighty hunters in the fields of truth,
Titans of thought, ye giants of renown,
Colossal wonders in the world of mind,
Who with the shadow of a soul immense
Cover creation,—though your genius charm
The eternal public of posterity,
Your names are nothing in the balance now.
Bend the stiff mind, and bow the stubborn heart;
And, in the pleadings of your helpless dust,
Go, take your station with yon cottage-girl,
Or chant a verse with yonder hymning child :
And, happy are ye, if like them ye feel,
That wisdom is our ignorance to know.
There, cast your anchors in the cloven Rock
Of Ages : far behind the veil it towers,
Deep as eternity, and high as God."—p. 373.

XXIII.—*Anchurus, and other Poems.* By WILLIAM EWART, M.A., Curate of Pimperne, Dorset. London: Ollivier. [12mo. pp. 226.]

THE principal poem in this volume relates the self-immolation of Anchurus to appease the wrath of the gods. The calmness and thoughtfulness which pervade the discourses of this prince with his friends, previously to his sacrifice, are most happily ima-

gined; and the whole is well conceived, and ably executed, furnishing clear evidence of a perfect familiarity with the best classical models. There are many other poems of merit in the volume. We would especially notice that on "the workhouse chapel," and on "Avon woods," as showing poetical power of a high class. We may add, that the tone throughout is all that could be wished.

XXIV.—*A Brief Argument for reviving in the Church and Realm of England the Ancient Synodal Action, &c.* By T. W. PEILE, D.D., &c. London: J. W. Parker.

THE learned author of this publication is well known to the public by his elaborate Commentary on the Epistles. The view here taken grounds the admission of Laity to the Synods on Scriptural precedent, and obviates the danger of disputed elections by vesting the nomination in Episcopal hands—a most important practical suggestion, and well worthy of attention.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AMONGST the publications which now lie before us, and which we are at present prevented from noticing by want of space, but to which we hope to return hereafter, are "Christ in Hades," by W. W. Lord; "Medwin's Sermons;" "Syriac and Chaldee Reading Lessons;" "A Reply to Phases of Faith," by Walther; Bishop Pearson's "Lectures on the Acts;" "Rural Thoughts," by Whiting; Stapf's "Spirit of Education;" "Babylon and Jerusalem;" "Songs of the Bells;" Laurence's "Services for the Sick;" "The Exiled Soul;" De Teissier on "The Lord's Supper;" "Lives of certain Fathers of the Church;" "Allerton and Dreux;" "The Crystal Palace;" "Miller's Sermons;" "The Three Paths," by Anderson; "The Turf;" "The Road," by Nimrod, and other Volumes of "Murray's Readings for the Rail;" "Lowell's Poetical Works;" Forbes on "The Christian Sacrifice;" Pickering's "Christian Classics;" "Gift at Confirmation;" "Caswell's American Church;" "Home is Home;" "Pigott's Patriarch of the Nile;" "England before the Norman Conquest;" "State of Man subsequent to Christianity;" "Bellis's Sermons;" "Lilias Davenant;" "Hawthorn's Scarlet Letter;" "Twice Told Tales," and other Volumes of "Routledge's Popular Library;" "Penrose's Sermons;" "Elements of Christian Science," by Adams; "Cavendish's Life of Wolsey;" "Wilkinson's Sermons," &c. &c.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

EUROPE.

FRANCE.—The ceremony of the installation of the President recently took place in the Church of Notre Dame.

The honours paid to a king anointed on the day of coronation are scarcely greater than those which attended Louis Napoleon on this occasion. A solemn "Te Deum" was performed in every Cathedral Church of France; the blessing of Heaven was invoked upon the country, and upon the man who has been appointed to sway its destinies for the term of ten years. The service concluded with the "Domine Salvam," thus worded:—"Domine, Salvam fac Rempublicam—salvum fac Napoleonem, et exaudi nos in die quâ invocaverimus."

The "coup d'œil" presented on entering the Cathedral of Notre Dame was very fine. The pillars of the great nave, adorned with purple-coloured banners, sprinkled with stars of gold; the velvet draperies and enormous garlands of foliage and flowers, which covered and fell from the galleries; the richly-decorated flags, carrying the arms and names of the chief cities of the empire; the columns of the sanctuary, covered from base to capital with silk brocade of crimson and gold; the altar in the choir, with its rich and gaudy ornaments; the benches for the authorities and the constituted bodies; and the galleries on either side crowded with persons; the orchestra of 500 musicians, vocal and instrumental, disposed in the galleries at the extremity of the choir, and the principal feature of all, the lofty dais, with hangings of crimson and gold, doubled with white, surmounting the "estrade," which faced the altar, and supported the "siege d'honneur," whereon sat Louis Napoleon with his "prie Dieu," the Archbishop of Paris (who officiated in the service) to his right, and the attendant Bishops to his left.

The President arrived exactly at noon, and the orchestra performed, while he entered the cathedral, and took his place, the march and "Vivat in æternum," by Lesueur. The "Te Deum," which Lesueur composed for the battle of Austerlitz, and which was afterwards performed in celebration of the taking of Algiers, displayed the strength and number of the musicians to the highest advantage. The hymn to St. Geneviève, the patron saint of Paris, and the offertory, which followed the "Sanctus" of M. Adam, and the "Domine Salvam," which terminated the ceremony in a highly effective manner, were executed to perfection.

The "Patrie" states the cost of the ceremony at Notre Dame at 190,000 francs.

M. Lacordaire, Superior of the Dominican Order in France, has been ordered to quit Paris, in consequence of some expressions in a sermon preached by him in the Cathedral of Notre Dame.

The "Univers" contains a long letter from the Irish Roman Catholic Primate Paul Cullen, returning thanks for the contribution of 13*l.* to the Catholic Association for resisting Anglican proselytism.

A chapter is to be created for the service of the Church of St. Geneviève, late Pantheon.

ITALY.—Accounts from Rome state that the Austrian Government has just offered to the Pontifical Government such great facilities for the creation of a Roman army, that that measure may now be considered as definitively decided on. The following is the plan on which this matter will be carried out:—All the existing corps will be disbanded and remodelled; two regiments of a foreign legion will be recruited for out of the country. Austria lends the town of Como as the centre of formation for this force; each of these regiments will be 2500 strong. These 5000 men will none of them be Italians, and, as far as can be, Swiss, Austrian, and Bavarian. Baden will also furnish its contingent. Two Roman or Italian regiments, each of 3500 men, will be formed from the remnants of the regiment of guards and other troops, which were in course of organization. The gendarmerie will be carried up to a strength of 5000 men, 4000 of whom are already enrolled; a battalion of foot chasseurs of from 1200 to 1500 strong, a regiment of dragoons, and one or two brigades of artillery, will complete this force of 20,000 men. The 5000 gendarmes, the 5000 Swiss and Germans, and the battalion of chasseurs commanded by M. Aldeon-Polomba, an officer devoted to the Holy See, will form an effective force which will insure the fidelity of the two native regiments, and will permit the Pontifical Government to protect itself with its own troops. The formation and the support of this army will entail fresh charges on the Treasury.

The Pope has issued a decree giving his sanction and benediction to an expansion of the "Association for prayers for the conversion of England," which is henceforward to embrace all who are separated from "the Church."

A petition is in course of signature among the British residents at Rome, addressed to the Cardinal Secretary of State, for permission to build a Protestant Church within the walls, the necessary funds being ready.

The following facts are comprised in recent communications from Florence. The Grand Duke of Tuscany continues to persecute Protestant Christians. One of these being very ill, was lately attended by two of his friends. The physician Gallori, a follower of the priests and of the police, instead of apprising the family of the state of the sick man, as was his simple duty, in order that his various social and religious duties might be attended to, seeing that the poor invalid did not ask for a confessor, because he said that he had peace in the faith and in the promises of his Saviour, himself called in the priest, who imme-

diately hastened to perform his part ; and forthwith asked the sick man if he believed in the Pope. "No ; but I believe in Jesus Christ." An animated discussion followed this beginning, and the sick man, who quoted many texts of Scripture in opposition to the nonsense and temptations of the man, became so tired, and his illness so aggravated, that his friend who was attending on him, and who up to that moment had been silent in a corner of the room, conceived that he was bound in charity to rise, and he said, "My friend, you have spoken well, but now it is enough." Upon this the priest, looking angrily at the speaker, took his hat, and ran to the Prefettura in order to vent his rage. Thirty gendarmes went to arrest the two attendants upon their friend, and the sick man himself is watched by one of the gendarmes at his side, who allows no one to enter the room but the wife and the brother. The priests went successively with extraordinary preparations for administering the communion ; they took care to keep away at that moment even the above-mentioned persons of the family in order that they might not have witnesses. But the continued abiding of one of the gendarmes, sufficiently shows that the sick man has not been wanting in faith. The two new prisoners are tranquil in spirit, because they know that "Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake." This happened on the 2nd of January, 1852.

GERMANY.—A Lutheran minister, named Eichhorn, in Baden, having attempted to revive the strict old Lutheranism, which has been supplanted throughout the greater part of Germany by the "Union" Church, a compromise between Lutheranism and Calvinism, has been arrested, and, in virtue of the state of siege, declared "a prisoner of war."

The current number of the "Home and Foreign Record of the Free Church of Scotland," contains a statement from Messrs. Wingate and Smith, respecting the circumstances under which they were lately expelled from Hungary. The following passage will interest our readers :—

"On returning home on Sabbath afternoon from the house of prayer, we found a summons waiting us from one of the heads of the police (who are a very different body, and clothed with very different powers, in Austria from what we are accustomed to in our own happy country) to appear before him next day. We speedily communicated with each other, and finding that both had been cited at the same time, and that the object could not, therefore, be to obtain information from us, but to make an announcement to us, we immediately anticipated the worst. On appearing at the time appointed, we were simply informed that an imperial order had arrived, to the effect that we should leave the country without delay. We demanded the reason of such summary proceedings against us. The councillor of police said, 'that, so far as he knew, the government had nothing against us personally, but that the nature of our functions was disliked by them.'"

We subjoin an extract from a letter written by Mr. Edwards, another

Missionary, who had been labouring in Lemberg, and who was also summarily expelled:—

“ *Breslau, Jan. 31, 1852.*

“ I arrived here yesterday, and only embrace the first leisure moment to let you know where I am, deferring all particulars till next week. On the 18th December, without any premonitory symptoms, the storm that had been long brewing burst, and I received orders not only to suspend my meetings, but to quit Lemberg and Galicia before the end of the month. In a personal interview with —————, I prevailed on him to retract the latter part of the sentence, and to bring the whole matter before the ministry in Vienna. He told me that there was nothing against me *but the enmity of the civil governor, who is a pupil of the Jesuits.* I wrote a statement of the case to our ambassador in Vienna, but before his answer came, having got a hint from a person in high official station, that nothing could be accomplished but by personal application, I resolved to undertake the journey, fatiguing enough at any time, but how much more so when the country was covered with snow! and on the 31st of January set out for Vienna. I obtained an audience, and stated my case to the Minister of the Interior, and for ten days did all I could think of to help the matter, but with so little success, that when my business was finished in Vienna, the police refused me a passport back to Lemberg, and I would not have obtained it, had not providentially a document in my favour been transmitted the same day from the highest court of the martial law in Lemberg to the police in Vienna. On the strength of this I obtained a billet, good for eight days, to return to Lemberg. There was now nothing for it but to remove my family, with Mrs. Edwards within a month of her confinement, a journey of more than 200 English miles, before we could reach the railway, and double that distance before we could reach Breslau, the first Prussian town in which we could hope for permission to take breath. On reaching Cracow, I requested a few days’ rest, that the weak members of the party might recruit from their fatigues, but was told sternly that I was not allowed twenty-four hours, but must immediately proceed; and if my family could not, I must go alone and leave them, and if we could not go the whole way to Breslau, we must go a part. By virtue of expostulation, we obtained a few days, but for which it would probably have been fatal to one of our number; and as soon as we were able for the journey, proceeded, and reached this only last night.”

The key to the whole of this painful history is, we think, clearly to be seen in the few words put in *italic*. For the first time for nearly a century, the Jesuits have obtained a complete ascendancy at Vienna.

SPAIN.—The subjoined correspondence has recently been published:—

“ *Madrid, July 6, 1851.*

“ Sir,—With reference to the note addressed to you by the Marquis of Pidal on the 4th of December last, I have the honour to state to you

that the Minister of the Interior has informed me, under date of the 3rd inst., that her Majesty has been graciously pleased to grant the permission requested by you for the construction of a burial-ground for British Protestants, under the following conditions :—

“ 1st. The burial-ground will be erected on the hill of San Damaso, outside the gate of Toledo, and it will be constructed with subjection to the hygienic or sanitary rules required by establishments of this kind.

“ 2nd. No church, chapel, nor any other sign of a temple, or of public or private worship, will be allowed to be built in the aforesaid burial-ground.

“ 3rd. All acts which may tend to the performance of any Divine Service whatsoever are prohibited. And

“ 4th. In the conveyance of the dead bodies to the burial-ground any sort of pomp or publicity shall be avoided.

“ These conditions, as you will observe, are the same which were contained in the Marquis of Pidal's note, and which have been adopted by her Majesty's government, in conformity with the opinion given on that subject by the Royal Council.

“ I have only to add that this Royal decision has already been communicated to the governor of the province of Madrid, and that you may direct the works to be commenced whenever it may suit your convenience.—I avail, &c.

(Signed)

“ EL MARQUES DE MIRAFLORES.”

“ VISCOUNT PALMERSTON TO LORD HOWDEN.

“ *Foreign Office, July 28, 1851.*

“ My Lord,—I have received your despatch of the 15th inst., inclosing a copy and translation of a note which the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs has addressed to you, stating that the Spanish government consent to the establishment of a burial-ground for British subjects at Madrid, upon certain conditions specified in his Excellency's note.

“ I have to instruct your lordship to state to the Marquis de Miraflores, that her Majesty's government are glad to find that the Spanish government has at last granted a permission, which, however, her Majesty's government are entitled by treaty to demand as of right; but her Majesty's government, in acknowledging this tardy compliance with the stipulations of the treaties between the two Crowns, cannot refrain from adding a strong expression of their deep regret to find that this permission is accompanied by conditions so inconsistent with the liberal spirit of the age, and indicative of a system of religious intolerance on the part of the Spanish government towards those who profess the Protestant religion, which forms so striking and unfavourable a contrast with the liberal and enlightened system of perfect religious freedom which prevails in the United Kingdom towards the professors of the Roman Catholic faith.

“ Her Majesty's government cannot but hope that the time is not far distant when principles of action which belong to an age now long gone

by will cease to be, in such matters, the rule of conduct of the government of Spain.

“Your lordship will give a copy of this despatch to the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs.—I am, &c.

(Signed)

“PALMERSTON.”

NORWAY.—The inhabitants of Finmark, the most northern district of Norway, have, in consequence of the preaching of missionaries belonging to some new sect, abjured Christianity, and driven away their pastors. Two clergymen sent to the spot by the Bishop of Drontheim, found men, women, and children lying about the streets, their clothes in disorder, and their heads covered with ashes, bewailing themselves as having by the creed in which they had hitherto lived incurred eternal damnation. In some parts this fanaticism has degenerated into perfect madness, and a body of troops had to be dispatched from Drontheim to quell the disturbance.

TURKEY.—The Sultan has just issued a firman in favour of the Christian Protestants, allowing them to meet together freely, and permitting their marriages and births to be registered.

The “*Débats*,” after giving the news from Constantinople of the change in the Turkish Ministry, adds:—

“After long and frequently interrupted negotiations, the question of the Holy Places has been, by the energy, activity, and skill of M. de Lavalette, brought to a conclusion. The solution is as favourable as possible; it is not contrary to the spirit of existing treaties, and is rather to the advantage of France, as the protectress of Catholicism in the East. The state of possession, according to the terms of the treaty of 1740, and Article 33 of the Capitulations, was, and has remained, the bases of the negotiation. All the rights of France, founded on these two documents, are fully and explicitly reserved. The Porte leaves in *statu quo* the claims of the Fathers of the Holy Land, relative to the holy grotto, purchased by them, and which they claim as their property. It engages to give up to the Latin monks the keys of the Church of Bethlehem, and it admits their right to perform their religious ceremonies in the Church of the Virgin. The Porte also engages to replace the star of the Holy Sepulchre, which was removed six or seven years ago, and that within a fixed delay. The monks at Jerusalem are authorized to repair some of their establishments, and to purchase land for the enlargement of others, a favour which they have for many years been soliciting in vain. Lastly, for all the places claimed by the Latin monks, there is granted to them a participation in common, that is to say, the power of performing the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, with the exception of one alone—the tomb of the Nativity.”

ASIA.

CHINA.—M. Schoeffler, a young Dutch missionary of the Popish faith in Cochin China, has been put to death for preaching his doctrine.

He was denounced by the Mandarins, arrested, bound hand and foot, conveyed to the capital Hue Fo, and condemned to death by a sort of judicial commission. He was hanged on a very lofty gibbet. More than 10,000 troops attended the execution, to prevent any hostile demonstration on the part of the numerous Christians of Hue Fo.

INDIA.—The Right Rev. Dr. Harding, Lord Bishop of Bombay, arrived at his destination by the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steamer "Achilles" on the 25th of November, and was formally installed in the cathedral on the Sunday following, in the presence of one of the largest congregations ever assembled there.

A clergyman in Ceylon, the Rev. B. Boake, who has for fifteen years invariably omitted the cross in baptism, has been admonished by the Bishop to adhere to the rule of the Prayer Book, which he has promised to do, after a correspondence, in the course of which he charges his Diocesan with "novelty" in the interpretation of the Prayer Book.

The "Colonial Church Chronicle" gives the following account of the state of the education of the poorer classes of the European and East Indian communities in India :—

"The only Christian schools in the Madras Presidency, supported by the government, are those attached to the head-quarters of the few European regiments and depôts, (to which the children of the soldiers of those regiments are alone admissible,) and the transferred Dutch settlements of Pulicat and Negapatam. With these exceptions, the rising generation of Europeans and East Indians, in the civil and military stations throughout the country, are left without any other education than is supplied by the clergy and their congregations, whose efforts, however creditable to them, are necessarily, in so fluctuating a community, desultory and ineffective, and so great a burden ought not to be thrown exclusively upon them. The neglect in this respect is still more marked in the case of the Christians (European, East Indian, and native) connected in various capacities with the native army, who are utterly destitute in this respect, while there is a government school in every native regiment for the heathen, and another for the Mahomedans."

AMERICA.

The following is a statistical summary of the Episcopal Church in the United States at the present moment :—

Dioceses, 20 ; Bishops, 33 ; Priests and Deacons, 1572 ; Ordinations in 1851—Deacons, 49 ; Priests, 66 ; Candidates for Orders in fifteen dioceses, 145 ; baptisms estimated for twenty-five dioceses, adults, 1926 ; children, 11,682 ; confirmed, estimated for twenty-seven dioceses, 6133 ; communicants, estimated for twenty-six dioceses, 67,206 ; marriages in twenty-four dioceses, 3711 ; burials in twenty-three dioceses, 6413 ; Sunday school teachers in nineteen dioceses, 4660 ; Sunday school pupils in twenty-two dioceses, 40,507 ; churches

consecrated, in twenty-three dioceses, 54; corner-stones laid in ten dioceses, 20.

BISHOPRIC OF NEW YORK.—The Rev. Dr. Creighton, recently elected by the diocese of New York to the provisional Bishopric, has, after mature consideration, declined to accept his election. After stating his reasons for keeping the question so long in suspense,—the urgent counsels and entreaties pressing him to accept, and his own anxiety not to consent or to refuse rashly,—the Bishop elect thus concludes his letter to the standing committee of the diocese:—

“In thus avowing a conclusion in opposition to the wishes and synodically expressed judgment of the diocese, I am discharging the most painful duty of my life. But it is one from which I cannot escape. That I love the Church with a true affection, I conscientiously believe; and I think I could cheerfully make any personal sacrifice for her good; but that very love for her makes me shrink from the thought of retarding her onward course through my incompetency. I feel deeply my deficiency in many of the qualifications indispensable for the Episcopate. That high office demands, and perhaps never more than at the present time, the highest endowments, profound theological attainments, intellectual power, physical strength and activity, patience, decision, and untiring application, in connexion with supreme devotedness and zeal in the cause of Christ. In too many of these I fear I am wanting; in others I am too conscious of falling short, to justify my assuming the guidance of so large and influential a branch of Christ's Holy Church. With a sense of my unfitness, how can I rise and solemnly declare before God and the Church, ‘I am persuaded that I am truly called to this administration?’ It is pain and grief to me, and in the opinion of some (few I trust) it may be my reproach, that I should utter it, but, oh! brethren, beloved in Christ, and for your own sakes, I cannot be your Bishop.”

The “New York National Police Gazette” contains a mass of disgusting details relative to the proceedings of the Mormon sect at the Salt Lake, from which it appears that plurality of wives is in full vogue there. Governor Young is said to have ninety wives. He drove along the streets a few days ago with sixteen of them in a long carriage, fourteen of them having each an infant at her bosom. Heber C. Kimball, one of the triune council, blasphemously called the second person in the Trinity, has almost an equal number; among them a mother and her two daughters. Each man can have as many wives as he can maintain, that is, after the women have been picked and culled by the head men.

MONTREAL.—The Lay Committee of the Church Society of the diocese of Montreal has made an appeal to the “laity” of the diocese, calling on them to take the initiative in providing means for the formation of new missions. They urge this as a duty imperative on every individual member of the Church, observing that if this sacred obliga-

tion were heartily fulfilled, the Society would soon have the means of sending new labourers into the Lord's vineyard, without subjecting the Missionaries to the personal privations which they undergo in the prosecution of their arduous duties.

NEW BRUNSWICK.—The late Hon. W. Chipman, Chief Justice, has by his will directed the interest of 10,000*l.* to be paid annually to the Diocesan Church Society of New Brunswick, and made handsome bequests towards the permanent maintenance of the Madras School, and towards the endowment of St. John's Church.

BARBADOS.—A very important and interesting commencement of the work of Missions for the conversion of negroes in Western Africa has taken place at Barbados. It appeared to its originators, that the most appropriate celebration of the Jubilee by them would be to commence, if practicable, within the year, or at least to take measures for commencing, a Mission to Western Africa. In accordance with these views, at the Barbados Church Society's annual meeting on the 16th June, 1851, it was determined to make the African Mission, not a mere branch of the Church Society's operations, but the object of a distinct Society, to be called "The West Indian Church Association for the furtherance of the Gospel in Western Africa, in connexion with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, as Trustees of Codrington College."

The object of this Association is stated in its title,—“the furtherance of the Gospel in Western Africa.” The course contemplated is that of a distinct Mission from the West Indian Church to Western Africa,—distinct, but not of necessity separate from, much less opposed to, the Missionary operations already alluded to. A holy rivalry indeed there may exist between the different Missions, but combined, it is to be hoped, with the fullest sympathy and good will, and, as far as circumstances may admit, with Christian communion and mutual encouragement, if not actual co-operation. To avoid any approach to collision, it is proposed to direct the West Indian Mission to parts of Africa unoccupied by the older Missions of the Church either in England or in America, if not utterly strangers to any efforts of Christian instruction, such as the kingdoms of Dahomey and Ashantee, with the coasts which skirt them: on one of which, the Gold Coast, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel had formerly a Mission for more than seventy years (i. e. from 1750 to 1826), which even recently they have contemplated reviving, and which it is hoped they may be induced and enabled to re-establish, perhaps in actual connexion with the efforts of this Association.

With respect to the Church Missionary Society, in order to remove any possible suspicion of an intended intrusion from hence on their labours, the Mission Board have stated that, when in England in January last, the Principal of Codrington College was requested to communicate with the Society, and to explain to them the nature and

objects of the Mission contemplated from hence; and that, in consequence, the following Resolution was passed by the Society's Committee of Correspondence on the 7th January, 1851 :—

“ That this Committee are rejoiced at the intelligence now communicated of direct attempts to evangelize Africa originating in the united Christian efforts of the white and coloured population in the West Indies; and that the new Association be assured of the cordial sympathy of this Committee, and their prayers for the Divine blessing on the undertaking, and their willingness to furnish any information which they may possess for the furtherance of the design, and especially copies of all translations into the African languages, or information connected therewith.”

We most cordially wish success to this noble undertaking, and trust it will be adequately supported.

AUSTRALASIA.

TASMANIA.—A remonstrance has been addressed to the Bishop of Tasmania by seven colonial Chaplains against various portions of the proceedings at the late meeting of Australasian Bishops, especially against the declaration on holy baptism; together with a demand for an appeal direct to the highest ecclesiastical authority in England, and an invitation to the Bishop to call an assembly of the Clergy and representatives of the laity, to deliberate upon a future constitution for the Church of the colony. The Bishop in reply expresses his belief that he is precluded from complying with the last-named request by the Royal declaration prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, and reminds the remonstrants that in the letters patent recently issued, it was provided that an appeal from the Bishop's judgment should lie to the Metropolitan of the Australasian province. Five of the seven Clergy have since solemnly protested against the colonial appeal. In another correspondence several Clergy denounce three books, “Steps to the Altar,” “Spiritual Communion,” and “Theophilus Anglicanus,” as containing unsound doctrine, while the Bishop vindicates the impugned works.

THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

JULY, 1852.

ART. I. — *Return to Parliament of the number of Juvenile Offenders committed to Prison in England and Wales in the Years 1849 and 1850.*

THE whole subject of the proper treatment of our convict population is one of the most difficult, while it is one of the most important, that can claim the attention of our legislators or our journalists. Ought any of them to be transported to our colonies? What can we do with them if we do not transport them? How ought we to treat those who are in prison? Has the solitary system failed? Can the silent system be enforced apart from the solitary? Ought prisons to be generally industrial establishments? Is it well to interfere with the labour of honest workmen by that of prisoners? Is it ever right to throw away the labour of prisoners? All these, and hosts of other questions of a like tendency, are at the present day really unanswered. The whole of this vast subject, deeply interesting to the philanthropist, of immense importance to the legislator, closely affecting every honest man and woman in the kingdom, is in truth an open question.

Now, the subject on which we desire to offer some remarks, is not precisely identical with any one of the points which we have expressly mentioned above; and yet it lies, as we firmly believe, at the root of the matter. The proper mode of dealing with our juvenile offenders, the mode of so dealing with them that they may not become old in crime, and may not swell the number of our convict population, must necessarily be worth the most serious consideration. It can be of but little use to try one scheme after another, which has for its object the deterring from crime of men and women, if, all the while we are endeavouring to frighten them, and doing but little really to reform them, swarms of boys and girls are growing up, initiated in every kind of vice, soon themselves to become men and women, “*mox daturi progeniem vitiosiore*.”

Indeed, we do firmly hold, that no amount of attention bestowed on the subject of the treatment of our convict population in general, can be at all available, as long as we allow ourselves to neglect juvenile offenders as they have been neglected; that no reform of prison discipline, no amount of instruction given in prisons, no novel schemes, however plausible, can meet and counteract the great evils under which we are now labouring,

until we go to the root of the whole matter, and strive zealously, as we never yet have striven, to reform young offenders.

The course which we would pursue in this article is, first, to inquire how such offenders, how boys and girls are generally dealt with when they are convicted of crime; and, secondly, to state how, in our opinion, they ought to be treated.

Before, however, entering on this subject, we would say a few words upon the difficulty of effectually dealing with young culprits. We believe, that persons unacquainted with the lower orders, or, perhaps, we may say with prisons, have an idea that it must be a vast deal easier to reform a boy or girl than a man or woman; that it is not a very hard task to persuade the boy or girl, comparatively unused as they are to crime, to give up illegal and dishonest practices; and to work honestly for their living. Now, of course, it is true that the practice of sin hardens a man's heart; that it is generally a more difficult thing to persuade one who is old and well versed in the ways of sin to repent and turn to God, than to prevail on one whose conscience has not become seared by oft-repeated, wilful sin, to turn and amend. This is a truth which we firmly believe. But because this is conceded, it does not follow that it is much more easy to persuade a young culprit to become honest, to desire to work honestly, than an old one. We concede simply, that the heart of one who has sinned for a few years may be touched more easily than the heart of one who has sinned for many. But this concession does not affect the whole question. Very important considerations remain which are not affected by it at all. Granting that the whole moral nature of a boy of fourteen or fifteen years of age is not so averse from good as that of many a man of forty or fifty, still we have to consider whether there are not influences at work, and that too very actively, which may cause the boy to be less willing to give up the practice of dishonesty than the man. We decidedly believe that there are. The man who has long lived a dishonest life has found out that the ways of sin are *not* ways of pleasantness, as far as this life is concerned. He knows, from his own experience, that there is such a thing as eating of the fruit of his own way, and being filled with his own desires. He knows that the loss of character is a decided evil; that he very often cannot, if he would, get employment when his character is gone; that what he refused once to believe, as to the certainty of sin blasting his character, is true. He knows that sinful practices destroy health. He knows, for he has tried it, that money got dishonestly, is comparatively useless. He knows that a shilling honestly made, will go further generally than five shillings which are the fruit of dishonesty. He knows that the penalties of the

law have their terrors. Time was when he thought it a small thing to be sent to prison for three months or six months. *Now* he knows it to be a very severe punishment. Once he had no friend for whom to care, none who really cared for him ; and he walked to prison with a light step and a careless heart, thinking himself as likely to find a friend within its walls as without. Now this is changed : he has a wife and children, for whom, in spite of his faults, he knows how to care ; and it adds considerably to the penalty of the loss of liberty, that he has to leave them uncared for while he is atoning for his crime.

But of all these evils the boy thief knows next to nothing : his calling—for to a London pickpocket picking pockets is as a calling—has its own peculiar inducements. The risks inseparable from it sweeten it not a little to him. It is a vast mistake to regard such a boy as one whose daily work is unmixed misery. It is by no means so. He takes considerable pleasure in it. He is not excited only by the hope of the shilling or eighteenpence which he may get for the handkerchief worth five or seven shillings, or by the idea of a successful inroad on the pocket of some unprotected female. The very pursuit of his game affords him no small excitement. The dodging a visible policeman round the corner of a street ; the detecting a well-nigh invisible detective by dint of his own acuteness ; the leading these gentry a long and well-ordered chase ; the exercising his calling in the self-governing city of London, and then being off into Middlesex when he sees an eye upon him ; the initiating into the *arcana* of his trade one younger or less practised than himself ; the meeting with his comrades in all kinds of dark alleys ; the keeping a careful and judicious look out when others are acting ; the ready receiving of stolen property the moment it has passed from its rightful owner ;—these, and many such dodges, do afford to the young street thief an amount of real excitement, which keeps him at his work fully as much as any hope of gain, and which operates on him far more strongly than it does on the man. And as the work by which he lives excites him, so also it is true that the fear of punishment is with him a deterring motive of much less power than it is with the man. The idea of loss of character molests him but slightly. If he has been not taught at all, or has been ill taught, it is not likely to trouble him. But if he has been well taught,—and many a London thief has,—experience has not shown him, as it has shown his senior, how great an evil this is. You may talk to him about the value of character as long as you please ; but generally the excitement of his work, and his liking of his companions, will be far too strong for you ; and till he has begun to be sorry that he cannot get work, in order

to which he must of course first wish to get it, he will care very little for any lectures that you may read him on the loss of his good name.

The same class of remarks applies forcibly to juvenile offenders of the female sex. They, too, know fearfully well what is the excitement of a vicious life. They, too, care extremely little for character, grievously as they often atone for the loss of it. We consider, therefore, that while it may be perfectly true that the man or the woman who has led a lawless, ungodly life, is more disinclined to turn to God than the boy or the girl, and that there may be a better prospect of bringing well-applied moral machinery to bear on the mind of the young offender than of the old, there are various influences at work on the mind of the young—influences which must not be disregarded—which make what is commonly called the reformation of the young culprit, the desertion by such an one of dishonest practices, and the seeking to live honestly, a matter almost, if not quite, as difficult as the reformation of the offender who has arrived at years of maturity.

Let us now inquire in what manner juvenile offenders are commonly dealt with when they are convicted of crime. Our remarks will be chiefly, if not entirely, confined to the mode of their treatment in the city of London, simply because with that we are best acquainted; although, probably, the remarks made on this subject will be found to be susceptible of a far wider application.

The common mode, then, of dealing with young pickpockets and such criminals is this. They are proved, on the oath of a policeman, or some independent person—most frequently the former—to have attempted, successfully or unsuccessfully, to pick a pocket. They are at once sent off to prison for a month, or two or three months, as the magistrate may please. The punishment with which they are visited is constantly found insufficient to deter them from crime. But is it to be expected that it should deter them? Are those whom they meet in prison likely to deter them? Is the inexperienced boy likely to be more desirous to be honest when he is liberated from prison, after passing a portion of his time with others far more experienced than himself? But to pass this by. Let us suppose the young thief, who has been once convicted and punished, liberated. Let us suppose that he again takes to thieving. Possibly he is not recognized at the police-office: his *alias* may serve his turn. He has grown three or four inches since his last imprisonment; and no one recognizes in John Smith the Thomas Williams of last year. If he is so unknown, the magistrate believes that in summarily convicting him, he is sentencing him to punishment for the first time. But

what if he is known? What if on his second, third, or fourth detection, various police-officers assure the magistrate that he is well known to them? Will he then be summarily punished? Will he then be made to undergo another imprisonment of two or three months, although his re-appearance at the police-court proves his unamended state? Unfortunately this is very often the case. Unfortunately it happens, that the officers in our city prisons can constantly say of this or that culprit, that he has been in the same prison four or five times. This seems to us to be a very great evil. Several causes may be assigned for it. One, and by no means an uncommon one, is the carelessness and haste of the magistrate. Such a functionary, disposed to get through his daily work as quickly as he can, seems often to consider the *temporary* removal from the streets of one known to be an old offender his primal care. "For three months at least you shall pick no pockets," is occasionally the mode of address adopted by such a functionary to the youth with whom he has to deal. He has it in his power to commit the boy to Newgate to take his trial; but he fails to do so. He may mean to be lenient. He may wish to give the boy another chance of stopping in his course before he runs a yet more imminent risk of transportation. But, be his intention as kind as it may, his practice is bad; he often, by adopting it, perpetuates the evil which it is his duty to cure.

And another reason of the repeated appearance at the same prison of the same prisoner, is the carelessness of the policemen. Ready as a policeman is to identify a prisoner, if he happens to be present when the offender is brought up for examination, there is very often a want of proper care in this matter. Only a week or two ago a case came under our own notice, in which a notorious pickpocket, who had been confined three or four times in one of our city prisons, was taken into custody, and carried to a station-house about two minutes' walk from that same prison. His appearance and bearing were most certainly not those of a young offender; and if a messenger had been sent from the station-house to procure the attendance of any one of the officers of the prison, the man would have been recognized, and on his appearance before the magistrate would, or ought to have been, properly punished. But no such precaution was taken; and so the culprit, not being identified by any one who chanced to be at the police-court when he was brought up, was again sent for three months to the same prison in which he had before been three or four times, where he is at this moment. It is only fair, however, to say that the evil of which we complain, the repeated imprisonment for short seasons of the same offender in the same

prison, will often arise from the circumstance that he is only *suspected* of being engaged in pocket-picking, and that the offence cannot be clearly proved; in which case, a magistrate feels it useless to send him to take his trial, and so summarily commits him as a rogue and vagabond.

But to return. The fact is, that from some cause or other, undue haste or carelessness, or some more excusable cause, it constantly happens that a boy, sixteen years of age, has been confined in the same prison three, four, or more times. This is a fact which every one conversant with a London prison well knows. And this fact sufficiently proves, at least as much as this, that *such punishment does not deter the offender from crime*. We may allude more particularly to a few cases appearing on the books of one London prison in the course of last year. We will mention them in the order in which they appear, premising that only eighty juveniles were there in the year. A boy, aged fifteen, was in that prison *three times* in that year. Another of the same age was there for the *second* time. Another, aged eleven, was there *twice* in the year. Another, aged fifteen, was there for the *eighth* time. Another, aged twelve, had been in another London prison. Another, aged fifteen, appeared *twice*. Another, of the age of twelve, had been in another prison, and only a few days intervened between his two imprisonments. Another, aged ten, had been in another prison. Another, aged fifteen, appeared for the *second* time. Another, aged fourteen, came in *twice*. Another, aged fifteen, was in the same case. Another, of the same age, was there for the *second* time. Another, only twelve years old, was *twice* there, having been for three months in one other London prison, and twice in a third (once for three months). Another, aged fifteen, was there for the *second* time. A girl, aged fifteen, appeared for the *fifth* time. Two boys, aged thirteen, appeared *twice*; one of whom had been also twice in another London prison.

Now if these few facts are worth any thing at all, they do prove that our present mode of punishing juvenile offenders does them remarkably little good. They prove that imprisonment does not deter from crime. They show, that while we are keeping up, at a great expense, a large staff of prison officials, and are flattering ourselves that we are helping thereby to reform our juvenile population, that population is not reformed. It seems that we cannot help inferring that the means which we employ are not those best calculated to bring about the end which we have in view. We do not wish to jump to this conclusion in a hurry; not to say hastily, "crime is still found to be prolific, and therefore the means by which we strive to obviate it are neces-

sarily inefficient." We know that a schoolmaster may strive hard to make boys work. He may employ means which experience has shown to be generally good; and yet he may find individual cases which baffle all his endeavours. He may have to thwart evil tendencies, to oppose evil dispositions which he cannot counteract, "*naturam expellat furcâ, tamen usque recurret.*" Just as the strongest appliances of religion may in vain be brought to bear on the vicious tendencies of man's nature, while religion is not in fault, even so it *may possibly be true* that, while our attempts to reform young offenders are found to be in very many cases utterly useless, still we are at present doing just what we ought in order to reform them.

But it seems to us, that a very little consideration will show that this is not the case: that the law has left a most powerful means of reformation almost untouched, and that until we make constant, vigorous use of such means, we have no right at all to flatter ourselves that we are taking all possible pains to ameliorate our social condition, by deterring juvenile offenders from crime.

With a view to clear the way for the full consideration of this part of the subject; what, let us ask, is usually the cause which has led a boy or girl astray? There can be little doubt, that, while several causes may be named, as helping to cause the fall of any such persons, *the evil example of others* is in almost every case the chief cause. Such evil example may have been set by parents, by brothers or sisters, by companions casually picked up in the court or alley, in the school, or in the workshop; or again, by men or women, who make it a practice to train those younger than themselves in vice: but a bad example is almost always the main cause of the wrong-going of the young. To punish a child, therefore, for any dishonest act that he may have committed, by placing him for a while where his evil tendencies are almost sure to be strengthened, and then, after confining him for a few weeks or months with offenders older and worse than himself, to allow him to return to the very places in which he has before been led astray, and to the very persons who have been his tempters, can surely not be a wise course. Surely the punishment intended (for this clearly ought to be one of its objects, though not the sole one) to deter a young offender from crime, should not be inflicted with almost a total disregard to that which is the chief cause of his wrong doing. We say, *almost* a total disregard, because of course it may be observed, that in committing a boy to prison for any time, however short, a magistrate does much which may prevent his being injured by the very same causes which have before been his bane. It may be said that he does, for a time at all events, sever the boy from old scenes and

old associates, and that so far he is likely to do him real service. To this we would answer, first, that when one, who is at all a practised thief, is sent to prison, he can scarcely be said to be severed from old associates, although he may be from old scenes; while one who is not a practised thief, too often only changes one set of wretched associates for another. And secondly, we would say, even granting that, under a really well-ordered system of prison discipline, a boy is effectually severed from *all* associates: granting that he does not exchange a word with a single being; granting, if you please, that he is not allowed even to see a single fellow-prisoner during his whole term of imprisonment; and that, therefore, his imprisonment does effectually remove him, while it lasts, from all chance of evil example: then the principle, if it be worth any thing, ought to be carried a great deal further. We say, if you allow that it is useless to try to reform a juvenile offender without removing him from the contamination of evil example, you ought not to be satisfied when you have merely provided that he shall be removed from it for a few weeks, or a few months; you ought not to allow him then to return to his old haunts and to his old associates. Many a time have we ourselves been distressed at seeing a boy met at the gate of his prison by three or four of his old companions, and led away by them in triumph, unquestionably to commence a new course of crime. Where is the hope, what reasonable man can have any hope, that any punishment which he has just suffered, any good advice which he has just received, will be of the slightest power, when its effect is daily counteracted by the worst example? Surely, it must be unnecessary to argue this point. Surely, every man of sense, whether he knows any thing of prison statistics or not, must feel sure, that if any good at all has been done, any spark of better feeling kindled in the boy's mind when he was a prisoner, that good must speedily be undone, that spark must be effectually quenched, in the midst of the open vice, ungodliness, and dishonesty, of which he is again a witness, and a willing one.

May we not, then, consider it a somewhat strange circumstance, and one much to be lamented, that our law does not at present attempt to provide at all effectually for the reformation of juvenile offenders, by subjecting them for a considerable time to good moral and religious training, and removing them during such time from the example of evil associates? Is it not much to be deplored, that not a single establishment exists in England, to which the law consigns juvenile offenders of either sex, *as a matter of course*, on their first or second offence, in which they may be taught an honest trade, and effectually separated from their old haunts and their old friends? We are perfectly well

aware of the existence of Parkhurst Prison, and a very excellent establishment we believe it to be ; but it does not at all meet the very great evil of which we complain. It does for many juvenile offenders, for many who are known to be old offenders, for many who have committed some daring crime, what we earnestly desire to see done for all, when they are first found guilty of any crime, however small it may seem to be, whether at assizes, or at quarter-sessions, or at a police-court. We wish to see established, generally throughout England, asylums, or penitentiaries, or reformatory schools (call them what you will), to which boys and girls found guilty of theft (perhaps of other crimes also) may be sent by way of punishment for their crime, and in which the attempt to reform them may be really and zealously made. We are inclined to think that no committal to such an establishment should be for a space of *less than one year*, and that generally it should be for double that time. Such establishments need not, ought not, to partake much of the character of prisons. A boy or girl who may have committed a crime, punishable under our present system by an imprisonment of three months, ought not to be treated in such an establishment for at all a longer period, as a prisoner is treated under our present system. Probably it would be better that such treatment should not be pursued at all. The deprivation of liberty, of that kind of freedom which above all the culprit loves—the liberty to go where he likes, and do as he likes—and the deprivation of it for a long period would, in all probability, be punishment quite sufficient. He could soon be made to understand, that the object aimed at in sending him to the school is not his torture—not the making life irksome to him for a few months (which, by the way, must now be a prisoner's ordinary notion of the great end of imprisoning him), but the keeping him apart from the injurious influence of those companions, at whose instigation most likely he committed the crime which has brought him into trouble : the teaching him to read and write, and exercise some honest calling, so that when he leaves the school he may, if he will, live without stealing. He would distinctly understand at the outset, that he had been sent not for a month or two, but for one or two years : and this certain knowledge would, as we firmly believe, have at once a very good effect upon him. For he would not feel, as a boy when sent to prison now almost always does feel, that he is precluded from the practice of dishonesty for a month or two, and that as soon as that time has passed, he is again to take to it as his calling : he would not, as he now does, be planning how, on the earliest opportunity, he might join his old companions in some lawless scheme : he would not, while undergoing the penalty or

one crime, be plotting the commission of another as soon as possible. He would feel that for awhile—a very long while as it would appear to him—he must of necessity have done with his old mode of living: and the knowledge that he could not for a long time employ himself as he used, would be at least a preparation for his taking something like an interest in other and better employments. Under the present system of short imprisonments, it is not only the case that the shortness of the time during which the discipline lasts, renders it useless to attempt in any way really to improve the juvenile offender; that it is evidently of no avail to set him to any thing but the merest mechanical work, simply because, long before he can be improved, he will be free from prison¹ (which he perfectly well knows, and therefore takes no pains); but it is also true, that the boy brings into prison and takes out with him his *pickpocket's mind*. He knows that he is committed only for a very short time. He makes up his mind to get through his imprisonment as best he can, and has not the slightest desire to do any thing when he leaves prison, save to lead the lawless life which he loves.

But while it decidedly seems to us that the main use for which such reformatory schools are needed, is that a boy or girl may be effectually separated from the evil associates who have led them astray, and from whom a short imprisonment does not, and cannot separate them; yet such establishments would be of vast use in other particulars. One cause which greatly tends to fill our prisons with juvenile offenders, is the utter neglect of parents. The children are not taught to do any good, and, as a natural consequence, they take to doing harm. Only a short time since, a return has been made to Parliament of the number of juvenile offenders committed to prison in England and Wales in the years 1849 and 1850, in compliance with a motion made by Sir J. Pakington, shortly before he became our Colonial Secretary; from which it appears, that on one specified day there were undergoing sentence in England and Wales 737 such criminals, of whom 327 were unable to read, *and as many as 554 had been brought up to no definite occupation*, 547 in England, and seven in Wales. Now, let us consider what chance there is that a boy or girl, neglected by parents, never sent to school (and if sent, probably learning scarcely any thing), brought up to no definite occupation, and so without any means of earning a living; exposed to the influence of bad example, shall be able, after being

¹ For instance; a few years ago a schoolmaster was engaged in a London prison to teach the boys to read and write; but the attempt was given up, and the master was discharged, because it was found that he could be of no real use to boys who were committed for periods varying from a week to three months.

in prison, to regain lost character, and to pursue a course of honesty. What is a boy of thirteen or fourteen years of age to do, even supposing that he does indeed wish to leave the ways of dishonesty, on finding himself discharged from prison, without the power of turning his hand to any kind of honest work? If he has a father or mother able and willing to help him, he will get a shelter if he chooses to avail himself of it. If not, if the unkind usage of a step-father or a step-mother has taught him that home is no refuge for him (and this is far from being an uncommon case), what is he to do? Even if he could work well, he would find it a very hard matter to get any employment. If he cannot work at all, he is driven to the resource of "jobbing about" in the streets or markets; and if he once comes to that mode of living, he soon takes to thieving as a resource. But suppose that such a boy had been, on his first being found guilty of any offence, sent to a reformatory school, and kept there for two years, and taught some work which might afford him a resource, much would then have been done towards enabling him to be honest. The chance would at least have been given to him. He would not be thrown on the wide world, as hundreds of young pickpockets are, friendless, and for any good, helpless. He would be able to show his credentials as one, who, though he had once gone wrong, yet had atoned for his wrong doing; and had since been well taught, and was known to be able to turn his hand to some useful work. His old evil associations would be broken through. Time, and the strong hand of the law, would have done their work in dispersing many who had set him a bad example; and surely it is not too much to hope that he himself would now, in some degree, have learnt to believe, that there is such a thing as an honest livelihood to be derived from honest employment, and that he would feel some desire to exchange for such employment, a mode of life promising only precarious, dishonest gain.

There will be, we apprehend, two great objections to this mode of dealing with juvenile offenders. The one, that the expense will be formidable in this age of economy and cutting down of expenses: the other, that the "liberty of the subject" must not be unnecessarily interfered with. On each of these two supposed objections we shall be glad to offer a few remarks. And first with regard to the question of expense. It must, of course, be impossible to *prove* that the plan which we now suggest may not cost somewhat more than that which is at present adopted. No statistics could prove this, because we cannot prove beforehand that the proposed plan would in many cases be successful. But we are strongly inclined to believe that expense would, in all

probability, be spared under the plan of long imprisonment, or rather, long confinement in the reformatory school; at any rate, that it would not be materially increased. We do not know precisely what it may cost to maintain a boy in prison for three months, but we do know perfectly well, for experience proves it, that many a boy undergoes several imprisonments of that duration, and that after having entailed on his country considerable expense by his various imprisonments, he is then at last sentenced to transportation for seven or fourteen years, and so puts honest men to a vast deal more expense.

Our present plan of proceeding, therefore, is unquestionably in many cases a very costly one. And we believe that the chances are, that the early confinement of the young offender in the reformatory school would in so many cases be the means of reforming his character, and of teaching him to become an honest man, that money would on the whole not be lost, but saved by dealing with him in the way which we suggest. And as to the second objection, arising from the fear of interfering without a pressing necessity with the liberty of a young offender, it may be remarked, first, that it is by no means certain that any such offender, even if confined for his first offence for as much as two years, would in the long run lose liberty. If his confinement in the reformatory school answered the end intended, and saved him from transportation, as it is our firm belief that it very often would, he would clearly be the gainer.

And, secondly, it is the duty of a legislator to do the best that he can, both for criminals and for honest men. If he believes, that, by acting vigorously with young offenders, he has a good chance of reforming them, of making them honest, and so of saving good citizens from their depredations; and if, moreover, he sees plainly that the plan now adopted does not produce this result, it seems somewhat an odd doctrine to hold that all his sympathies are to be in favour of the thief. There is a vastly unnecessary expenditure of morbid sentimentality in favour of culprits now-a-days.

But perhaps it may be said that much is already done with a view to satisfy our desire; that we have some reformatory schools in England; that a number of juvenile offenders are received in them; and that after all we can do but little good by sending any such offenders against their will to any such schools; that as men are not to be made religious by act of Parliament, so neither can they be reformed by any coercive measures. We could say a good deal about some of our reformatory schools, but we are unwilling to lengthen this paper more than can be helped. Of Parkhurst Prison we have before said a few words, and need

not now say more ; because *as none are sent thither who have not been sentenced to transportation*, it is at once quite plain that it fails, on principle, to supply the want in question. The schools of the Philanthropic Society at Red Hill, and the Bridewell House of Occupation in St. George's Fields, Southwark, may be mentioned, as each, in its way, proceeding in a right course, and calculated to do—we feel sure doing—a great deal of good. But they do not at all meet or remedy the evil. One very serious objection to the practically useful working of the latter establishment, is to be found in the fact, that while more than one hundred young persons of each sex are frequently sheltered within its walls, well taught, well clothed, well fed, protected from an infinite deal of evil, and often restored to a respectable position in society, yet a rule, which has now been in force some little time, excludes from all participation in its benefits every young person of either sex who is under the age of thirteen years. A mistake, more fatal to the real utility of such an institution, could not, as it seems to us, very easily be made. The intentions of those who enacted such a rule were, no doubt, excellent ; but assuredly they did, by ever enacting it, and do now by enforcing it, seem to shut out from all possibility of help a very large number of those who most peculiarly need protection, and who are, just because they are young, most likely to answer the end which all who are really interested in the institution have in view. For surely no man can walk along the streets of London often, without receiving abundant proof, that a London boy of thirteen is as far advanced, as independent, as impatient of rule, as difficult to be restrained, and therefore as unlikely to be persuaded to enter a reformatory school, or to be reformed if he does enter it, as most country boys who are two or three years older. And if any man requires further proof of the precociousness of young London boys than such as a few walks in the streets will give him, he has only to enter a London prison, and investigate for himself a few of the many cases always to be found there, in order to be convinced. There he will soon see that it is by no means an uncommon thing to find a boy twelve or thirteen years old, sufficiently independent of parental rule to have left his home, and to be living by himself, completely without control, lodging at some low lodging-house, supporting himself as best he can, getting work now and then by carrying parcels, hanging about markets and wharfs, helping to unload boats, and very often picking pockets. Now, when it is left perfectly optional to a boy, whether he will become an inmate of a reformatory school or not, is it of the slightest possible use to endeavour to persuade one who is thus independent of control to enter it ? The thing of all others most dis-

tasteful to such a boy is discipline. The year or two which he has spent in lounging about the streets in idleness or crime; the companions whom in that time he has picked up; the tastes which he has contracted and strengthened;—these all make him, at the age of thirteen, infinitely less likely to care to enter an asylum, or, if he does enter it, far less likely to remain in it, or, if he does remain, far more likely to corrupt his companions, and to get no real good himself, than if he had been sought out and persuaded to become an inmate when he was ten years of age.

We were informed a few months since by a clergyman, the curate of a populous parish in Westminster, that he had been the means of gaining admission to the house of which we are writing for several young persons in his district; and he spoke with sorrow of the existence of the restriction in question, by reason of which he had been prevented from so assisting a girl who, before she was quite thirteen years of age, was actually a prostitute! Who can say that, had she been admissible when she was ten years old, she might not have been saved from utter ruin?

But the notion which we desire especially to combat is, that any number of reformatory schools, to which juvenile offenders may go at will, or may refuse to go, can possibly answer the required end. Experience shows all who have had it, that either the parents or the young persons continually refuse to accede to their being sent. The objection comes, as might be expected, most frequently from the latter, but by no means only from them. A case came under our own notice, not very long ago, when a sharp, intelligent, clever boy, of about thirteen, who had been sent to prison for robbing his employer, was willing to go to an asylum. His old employer was asked to take him back into his service, but refused. Here, then, was a case in which it surely might have been supposed that parents would have hailed the idea of easily getting such a home for a boy, who, having once been in prison, was not very likely to get another place, and who, from his acuteness, was most likely to get into mischief. The parents were strongly urged to allow the boy to go, but refused. It is of course easy to understand why a poor father or mother, themselves destitute of good feeling, should wish to keep a boy at home. They gain something by his work, however little it may be, and they had rather that he should remain at home, and bring them a part of his earnings, than that he should leave them with the best end in view.

And the cases in which the young refuse to make use of an asylum, when it is offered to them during imprisonment, are so numerous, that the conclusion is forced on the mind, that it

is useless to expect that reformatory schools, filled by volunteers, can ever be fully available. We have looked into the books of a London prison, in order to see how the case stood in this respect ; and we find that in the course of the year 1851, twenty-eight juvenile offenders, out of a total number of eighty, refused the offer of an asylum on their own account, while the parents of one other refused their consent, and thirteen others availed themselves of the refuge. It is no part of our duty to inquire why the remaining thirty-eight neither refused an asylum nor were sent to one : probably this result was in most cases produced by the simple fact, that there was no room for them in any asylum to which they might have been sent from prison. But we are sufficiently sanguine to believe, that if each one of those eighty culprits, who first became amenable to the law between the ages of ten and twelve years, had been compelled to go to a well-managed reformatory school, comparatively few of them would have appeared a second time before a magistrate. We have already observed, that it is easy to understand why parents often refuse to allow a child to go to an asylum. It is quite as easy to understand why the boys themselves are unwilling to go. Confinement in an asylum appears to them as a punishment, and they have no idea of undergoing this punishment, in addition to that which they have suffered from imprisonment.

We commend this subject to the most serious consideration of our legislators. Sir John Pakington may be found to be an excellent Secretary for the Colonies ; but we are somewhat sorry that a member of Parliament, who has turned his attention as long as he has to the proper mode of dealing with juvenile offenders, should be, as we presume he now must be, unable to bestow his thoughts on a subject of so great importance. Offenders of this class are by no means decreasing in number. By the return lately moved for by Sir J. Pakington, we find that as many as 489 more were committed to prison in England in the year 1850 than in the preceding year. In 1849 their number was 6489 ; in 1850 it was 6988. And assuredly this is a very serious consideration ; especially so, if the case be, as we firmly believe it to be, that our present mode of punishing such criminals by no means tends effectually to deter them from crime. Even if we could separate our idea of juvenile offenders altogether from that of adults, the matter would assume a vast importance ; for it is surely our duty to endeavour, by all the means in our power, to deter the young from crime. But we cannot thus separate them. "The boy is the father of the man ;" and when we find nearly 500 juvenile offenders sent to prison in one year in England above the number of those who had been committed in the previous year, we know very well that

there is that increase, not merely in the number of *young criminals*, but of offenders who will almost certainly become lawless men and women ; who will, in their own persons, and by their example, greatly add to the number of our dangerous classes ; who, wherever they go, will spread an atmosphere of vice and immorality around them ; will swell the ranks of chartism and sedition ; and render all good government more and more difficult of attainment.

We earnestly trust that this subject may soon meet with the attention which it deserves. We earnestly trust that the evil may be attacked at the fountain-head ; that the *chief* attention of our legislators may be turned to the prevention of crime, rather than to its punishment. Punished, of course, it must be ; but how infinitely better will it be *for us as a people*, if we can succeed in preventing its growth by the reformation of those in whom it is seen to be first developing itself, than if we look on almost passively till it has got head, and must be repressed by the most severe measures. How infinitely better will it be for the temporal and eternal interests of those who now pass through life a scourge to all about them, and their own worst enemies, and pass out of life without a gleam of hope, if we can succeed in showing them, while they are young, that honesty does indeed offer to them a rich reward ; if, by separating them from evil companions, and at least compelling them to see what a virtuous life is, we can prevail upon many of them to believe that rulers, while they are, and ever must be, a “terror to the evil,” yet do indeed desire to be, as unquestionably they ought to be, the “ministers of God to *them* for good.”

ART. II.—*Our Doctor, and other Tales of Kirkbeck. By the Author of "Lives of the Fathers," "Tales of a London Parish," &c. Edited by the Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A., Vicar of Frome.* London: Masters.

THE number of religious tales published within the last ten years must be something enormous: from the three volumed novel, down to the penny tract, they meet us in every direction, and in every phase and mode of religious opinion. And judging from the multitude of these publications, we may fairly infer the incessant demand for works of this class; and hence also the influence which they are exercising on the opinions of the more educated classes. We believe that the religious views of no inconsiderable section of the community amongst the youth of the higher classes, are in great degree formed by religious works of this lighter and more popular character. The power of composing tales of this kind is evidently no uncommon circumstance; and we are continually meeting with volumes which really evince no inconsiderable power, and which possess many charms of composition. The *Tales of Kirkbeck* are an example of works of this class. They are written with good taste and even elegance, with feeling, piety, and simplicity; and their interest is such that it is difficult to lay down the volume. We presume that the tales are more or less founded in fact; but their dramatic power is very considerable; the dialogue is sustained with spirit, the descriptive parts are graphically told, and the tales are wrought up with artistic power. Generally speaking, they are of a very serious and even melancholy character; but their sadness is always relieved by the spirit of religious hope and consolation which they pourtray, and often in a very touching and affecting way. The writer, however, is quite as much at home in livelier as in graver topics, though the former are certainly not the staple of the volume. The reader will agree with us that the following picture of a village doctor is ably executed:—

“If there ever was a pattern village doctor, a very model of kindness and benevolence, and goodness and skill, it was (and I am thankful to say yet, *is*) Dr. Martin. An enthusiast in his profession, in which, notwithstanding his little conspicuous abode, he was a distinguished member, and continually sought out in consultation through several counties round—ay, and further too, for more than once we have been abandoned to fevers and neuralgias and all the aches and pains that

flesh is heir to, while our good doctor was summoned to some urgent matter in London town itself ! We used to compare him to a certain well-known classic celebrity, and say that every follower of Esculapius, from the dignified M.D. of our cathedral town, who is too fat to walk, and consequently drives a roomy chariot, to poor old Joey Bassomthwaite, who kills or cures half the countryside with his herb-teas, and spider-and-thimble charms, gave *himself* the first place as king of all doctors, and doctor Martin the next. I know I for one would rather trust my life, or what is far dearer, my brother's, in his hands than to the whole College of Surgeons—ay, and Apothecaries' Hall to boot !

“ Well, but Dr. Martin's qualifications do not stop at physic. He is a botanist, (and a bit of a quack I strongly suspect too, with his simples and decoctions, now and then !) an entomologist—by reason of which his drawing-room, as the housekeeper by courtesy calls it, is full of gorgeous butterflies and other unfortunate insects, most unpleasantly impaled on ferocious looking spikes—a lover of natural history generally—wherefore stuffed birds and beasts encumber every corner of the house ; and once when he had begged me to go up stairs in search of some particular treasure, I was scared out of my senses by encountering a huge wolf, whose large glaring eyes, to my great relief, turned out to be glass only. And further, turn where you will, some live thing corroborates Elsie Braith's statement, (I hope you remember Elsie Braith ?) that the ‘ doctor is terrible fond of them craters, and sure when he's so tender to reasonable beins, ane suldn't grudge it him.’ Somehow though, you generally find a kitten in every chair, and a small rough dark dog—something like one of those hairy caterpillars at which in childish days I used to shudder, coiled up on the sofa ; and not unfrequently if Lioness or Macbeth—the doctor's two great Newfoundland dogs) have recently been performing their ablutions in the beck, you may get as they shake themselves, something so closely approximating a shower bath, as to make one inquire whether the hitherto orthodox physician has turned hydropathist ! Then there are rabbits and guinea pigs, and favourite poultry without end—cocks that crow as no other cock ever crowed—hens that either are uglier, or more beautiful, or lay more eggs, or bigger eggs, or smaller eggs, or something, than anybody else's—guinea fowls that will fly at everybody but their master—turkeys that have a marvellous knack of getting given away about Christmas time—rare ducks that lord it over everybody else's in the beck, even the parson's—pigeons that evidently consider the whole house their own property—and ‘ little birds’—(as the whole lesser tribe is denominated when they appear as a ‘ roast’ on one's table in Italy) quite without number, from rare Australian parrots which dazzle one's eyes with their gorgeous plumage, and crack the drum of one's ears with their horrible screeching, to that dear intelligent bullfinch who would just as soon think of inhabiting a pie-dish as a cage, and sits on a certain tall disused piece of chemical apparatus in the doctor's laboratory—I call it—*shop* he calls it ; and pipes away ‘ There's nae luck about the house,’ in a way that would certainly drive every single patient off

in despair, if long experience had not taught them to believe the doctor rather than his bird. Oh Bully, Bully, you are but a wicked fellow I fear! and assuredly yours is the only voice raised in falsehood in that house!"—pp. 3—6.

The character of the doctor is indeed delightful, and his personal appearance, if we may judge from the following sketch, is exactly in keeping with such a character:—

"Shall I finish with a personal sketch? and shall it be taken when the good doctor is 'outside his baste', his long legs nearer the ground than might be considered in correct proportion, and his somewhat spare person rendered portly by the manifold drapings of his grey plaid, as he sallies forth on a wintry afternoon to see some hill-side patient? or when stooping with knitted brow and compressed lips over his paper, while the pen emphatically sets down healing combinations? or best of all, when kindled with some benevolent scheme, intent upon others' good, he is warmly discussing his point,—his eyes beaming with activity and intelligence, and every muscle ready to work?"—p. 10.

We have serious thoughts of settling down at Kirkbeck ourselves, for undoubtedly the village and its vicinity appear to be fertile in the production of characters of the most charming description, and in exhaustless variety. As to Dr. Martin, we long to make his personal acquaintance. The doctor is an important personage in the volume before us, making his appearance in all the tales on some errand of good or other. In the first tale which is denominated in his honour, "The Doctor," we have a narrative of an adventure in which he is made the means of rescuing a young person from a position of peril in which her own thoughtlessness had placed her. The story opens on the return of the doctor to his dwelling, "that odd-shaped low building nearly opposite the vicarage," whither he had just returned after a long hot ride on professional business. He had just got established in his cool study, and was looking "with considerable satisfaction at a neatly napkin-covered tray which Elsie had deposited at his elbow, with his old-fashioned squirrel-headed silver teapot, exactly suited for one person, and its accompaniment of rich cream, and a plate of the freshest, nicest of bread and butter,"—(we like little details of this kind—how much reality the "squirrel's head" gives to this description!)—well, at this important crisis, a sound of drums and fifes is heard disturbing the quiet of the village, and this, on inquiry, proves to be caused by a troop of equestrians who have come to show off their feats of horsemanship to the admiration of the neighbourhood. Various intermediate incidents occur, and then the doctor is called in to attend on one of the troop, or, as it turns out, on a

young lady who had foolishly engaged herself to join the troop in order to escape from a disagreeable home. Fortunately the young lady is not engaged in any other way to the manager, and so there is no great difficulty in placing her under the doctor's care, where she becomes a fixture for a time, and then is married—not to the doctor. There is not much incident in this story, but it is nicely and well told, and all the details are so well wrought out, that it is very pleasing.

The tale entitled "St. Patrick's Cliff," is, we think, still better written than "The Doctor;" the incidents are more striking, if not more ably developed. It commences with the description of a fishing village at the extremity of the long narrow valley of Kirkbeck, and, amongst other points, of a chapel placed on the summit of the adjoining cliff. It is pretty clear from the following account of the feelings of the writer, that he or she would gladly hail the re-establishment of the Roman Catholic worship and faith. We apprehend that those who think with the writer would be willing to hand over Westminster Abbey to Cardinal Wiseman if it were supposed possible that the Bishop of London had no prior claim.

"On the very extreme point of the cliff, just where it rears its head in sight of many a mountain, and towers over many a long mile of blue waves, there stands a little chapel—ruined it is true, yet reading a lesson of no light import in the firm strength with which its massy stones yet cling together, of the immovable unchanging strength of the Faith which is built upon a rock. True the roof has long been torn by wild storms, or perhaps by wilder, more ruthless hands of men, from off the little haven of faith; but the star-spangled sky or the glorious sunlight are its roof instead; and though no altar now invites us to bow the knee, though the quaintly-carved portal can neither close upon the profane intruder, nor open its typical gate to those who, weary and heavy laden, seek their rest where they know it can never fail,—yet, thanks be to God, no neglect, no sacrilege can ever undo what once was, and as long as one stone shall stand there, ay, until the very cliff itself shall crumble into dust, it will ever be a sacred spot, consecrated by that which has been—consecrated by solemn rites, and prayers and vows, which, though long since forgotten by men, and those who offered them passed away from hence, as they had never been, yet are each and all recorded in that Book, which will be awfully opened at the Judgment Day; both those who reared that little chapel as a beacon to the storm-tossed sailor, and those who desecrated it: those who now smile coldly upon its departed 'superstition,' and those who would rather kneel down and whisper a prayer of faith in union with all who have knelt there before, and with the holy angels who yet linger round the sacred spot where now men have ceased to pray.

"Yes, call it holy ground—for of a truth as to the pure all things are

pure, so to the faithful of heart many things are full of faith which mere men of the world despise and think lightly of.

“Do the sailors find a calmer sea, or toss with fewer perils over that stormy winter deep, because the little lamp no longer twinkles from the narrow loophole of S. Patrick’s Chapel? Do the mothers and wives and sisters pray more fervently for their perilled dear ones now, than when with reverent steps and beating hearts they climbed the rocky hill, and knelt within the walls where *their* mothers (then like themselves perhaps, young and hopeful, now long since sleeping in the church-yard hard by,) had in like wise knelt praying for those who after all their escapes from sea and storm were at last called to their final account—the course of all men?

“Men may say what they will—I cannot argue—I will rather kneel down in the narrow grassy precinct of S. Patrick’s little chapel, and thank God that he has given me the blessing (for of a truth it is a blessing) of joining in spirit their prayers who beheld him in the angry storm, and in the smooth sunlit ocean, and knelt here as they did so; of admiring and reverencing faith rather than condemning a so-called superstition, which in reply does more silently, but how impressively! rebuke the cold-hearted worldliness of present days.

“Yes, Moulton is a changed place since it boasted that it contained no lawyer, no doctor, no schoolmaster! Plenty of all these are now doubtless, but fewer of those who in former days rendered their services unnecessary. Of old, the priests belonging to that little church found time not only to keep its sacred walls ever open, and its sonorous bells sounding many times a day their musical summons to prayer and preaching, heard on the still summer’s eve far up the eastern valley—reaching to the summit of those ragged blue mountains that seem to hold the bay in their ample lap, and mingling harmoniously with the tiny breakers that foam like mere playthings over that dark line of rocks else scarcely visible in their lurking danger to the pilot’s eye. Not only did the good priest send out God’s music, calling as it were

“‘O all ye works of the Lord, bless ye the Lord: praise Him and magnify Him for ever.

“‘O ye mountains and hills, bless ye the Lord: praise Him and magnify Him for ever.

“‘O ye seas and floods, bless ye the Lord: praise Him and magnify Him for ever.

“‘O ye children of men, bless ye the Lord; praise Him and magnify Him for ever.’

“But they also found time to fill the physician’s part of healing, and the preceptor’s part of teaching their flock; and the medicine was mixed with many a prayer, and the lesson taught with many a text; and perhaps the patient and pupil prospered even as well as now! Ah well! but I must not forget myself Who it was that said to one over eager to question,—‘What is that to thee? follow *thou* Me.’”—
pp. 39—42.

We certainly cannot but admire a spirit of Christian charity; but Christian charity should remember that it is connected with truth, and that it cannot hold out encouragement to error, or excite sympathies with what contains a fearful admixture of error, as if it were the very purest and best system on earth. We fear that the writer is one of that class of persons who will not see any thing in Romanism except the virtues of some of its members, or the good side of some of its institutions. A truce, however, to such unpleasant surmises, and let us accompany our writer in the story.

“Now and then some little children would find their way from the generally more attractive beach; and listen wonderingly to my tales of the ruined chapel and its narrow graves yet visible in the hard rock, where the shapes of coffins are hewn out in several places, wondering about the child who must have lain in that *very* little bed, so still and so cold! But I had one almost daily visitor in whom I began to grow really interested. He was a man of from fifty to sixty, well made, and but for his exceeding emaciation and haggard countenance, of good and comely exterior. He was dressed in sailor’s costume, but he did not appear to be occupied in marine toil. He generally came slowly rambling up the hill, and sitting down upon the extreme edge of the cliff, he would look out to sea very earnestly, then down below upon the sands, and at last always visited the coffin hollows in the rock, and all as if he were looking for something.

“At first when I saw this man I supposed him to be some invalid recovering from sickness, and, like myself, strengthening on the fine air of S. Patrick’s Cliff; but the second or third visit this impression was changed, and I determined to speak to him. ‘It is a great height down to the sea there,’ I said, for he had just been hanging over.

“‘Ay, ’tis,’ he answered.

“‘And dangerous, I should think. Has any one ever fallen over the cliff?’

He looked up at me with a sad stare, and then said slowly, ‘Na, na, shou didn’t fa’ ower t’ cliff—twarn’t that gate shou deed. I maun go seek her!’ and in a moment he was descending the cliff again by a part hardly less steep, to the sands below.”—pp. 45, 46.

This leads to the discovery of the sad story of the unfortunate wanderer, which is told by his aged mother in such a broad north country way, that we find it no easy matter to understand the whole of it. For instance, what an outrageous perversion of the Queen’s English is “shou” for “she!” The book positively ought to have a glossary attached to it. The old woman’s story is that “puir Steevan,” her son, was engaged to a young woman, who is thus described:—

“And just down town there’s a girt big farm-house, ye’ll hae mindcd it may be? it’s no as it used to be now. Howsomever, ’twas a big place once, and Farmer Dawson (him as lived there) was a proper man, and a weel to do. He had ae dawter, an’ shou was Mary, my Steevan’s ain dear luve,—an’ nae wonder either, for she was as bonnie a lassie as could be seen the lang o’ Morecombe, or any where else for that. Shou was just the gentlest and safest bairn ye can fancy, and yet somehow shou was brave as a lion too. It’s my belief there was naething at a’ Mary wad not hae dune if shou thocht to be sarving her God or helpin’ her neebor in his trouble. Ye could tell it in her e’en, they were sae blue and sae saft like, and yet at times when owt raised her sperrit they wad be all aleet, mair like twa stars on a frosty winter’s night than owt else. There was naebody in a’ town but loved Mary, and several lads wad hae kept company wi’ her, but she wad nane of them; Steevan was her first and only lad, and tho’ I’m his mither, I will say shou might hae dune warse. Ye wadna think maybe to see yon puir silly fallow wi’ his lang thin face and dark e’en, that he was sae handsome ance? But he *was*, an’ a gude fellow too, an’ owld Tommy Dawson (as we ca’ed him) couldna say nae to Mary when shou said sae pretty like that it was marry him she wad. But in truth I maun tell ye, Steevan had ae fault, it’s no sae oncommon in these parts, and more’s the pity, for there’s mony a proper lad lost in this warkl, and may be in t’ next too along o’ it. Ye’ll guess it’s drink I’m meanin’. Ay, and Steevan *did* get too much some whiles.”—pp. 48, 49.

“Puir Steevan” one evening is drunk; and “Steevan” has been intrusted with the care of some cows, and Mary in her love for him goes to drive home the cows, which her lover was unable to guide himself; and so the sad tale proceeds:—

“Meanwhile, Mary set oot to fetch t’ kye;—they was in a large pasture runnin’ down to the shore, and there was mair nor ane way o’ gettin’ there. Ane was gaeing a’ roun’ town, and was langish. Anither was ower S. Patrick’s Cliff, or else ye could come down ower t’ sands. Mary chose the cliff, for she had nae fears of owt that wasna holy there, though there was mony a lass, ay and lad too, that wad hae gane round the haill bay or they’d a’ crossed S. Patrick’s Cliff, o’ a dark night, and that no for fear o’ the cliff, but o’ ghaists.

“Mary went ower however, for owld Bill ’t sexton war just ganging to toll t’ bell for Peggy Eastwaite’s lile lassie as had deed a’ t’ croup, and he seed Mary gae up the cliff. It was terrible windy, and it’s like she scarce could keep on her feet a top, there were marks o’ her clogs seen i’ the boglike mud as if shou had been blown hither and thither. Well, it’s like shou found t’ kye, and thocht shou wad bring them hame alang the beach, for ye parsave she couldna bring t’ kye ower t’ cliff, by rayson there was no but a footpath, and it was sae wet and late to gae roun’ town, and shou wad be missed, and a’ the tale telled aboot Steevan. Any how, that’s what we reckon shou thocht, for nae livin’ sowl ever heerd her sweet voice agin, or saw her bonny saft blue e’en.

Shou comed down on to sands, and then tide was creepin' up gay fast : crowlin' and creepin', and foammin' ; but the wind made sic a blather that it's like shou didna hear the sea as else shou wad hae dune. Whan she saw her peril, or how her soul travailed in her, as she secd a cold cold death comin' up in the waves, and thowt that she wad never mair see her father or mither or Steevan, or the light o' God's heaven, there's none can say, for nae mortal was near her, and save the poor dumb kye and the rowlin' waves and rushin' wind there was nowt but thick darkness round. Maybe the angels made light for her in the darkness, for shure she was in gudeness like the innocent babes that they say (it may be true, or it mennot) see the holy angels as they lig in their wee bit cradles, and smile to them afore they even smile to their mithers.'

" ' She was lost then ? '

" ' Lost ? Lord bless ye and save ye ! what hope was there for her on they cold sands wi' the tide drivin' up like a snow wraith, and the night as murky as the Egyptians ? ' Night waxed, an t' mither began to wonder that Mary didn't come ; at first she thowt shou'd maybe come to see me wi' Steevan, but it wasna like Mary to do that, and when shou went to cowhouse, shure enough it was empty ! Then shou got sorely frettened, and then in came owld Tommy frae Lancaster, expectin' his ain bonnie wee Mary (as he aye called her) to run into his arms and hug him, and when he heerd frae the mither how it was, he was just like ane distrought. ' The tide ! the tide ! ' was a' he could say.

" ' Then they came runnin' through the toon, and ca'ed on Steevan, and he wak up, and it a' cam upon him at ance, and he turned white and cowl'd for ever like a deed man. Then they a' turned out wi' lanthorns and shoutin's, but the night was sae murky that they could never see a yard afore them, an' no one could find his way—the wind blew out a' their leets, and what wi' its roaring and their trouble o' mind, they only went wanderin' over and over the same place and fand nowt. When it was past twal' o'clock, folks persuaded old Tommy to gang hame, and said for sure Mary was safe somewhere. He couldna believe them, a father's heart is no light to easen, but he was spent-like, and he went hame, and sat a' night by t' fire, never sayin' owt gude or bad, but startin' and lookin' up wi' a shiver every time the wind howled louder than usual down the chimley, or that onybody stirred.

" ' Everybody went hame 'cept Steevan. I saw him nae mair that night, and I knew weel he was searchin' for *her*.

" ' As soon as morning light cam, a gold grey sad light it was, the seekers began again, and they searched along the shore, but nowt did they see. The storm had washed up many a bank of sea-weed that night, and at last, close up under t' cliff they spied some ane sitting crouched up alongside o' a grit heap of green weed. Then they went to look, and sure an it was my Steevan, nigh perished with t' cowl'd, and his face quite awesome like to see. He was not alone, for close beside him, and yet half covered with the chill slimy dank seaweed lay Mary—stiff and cowl'd, her bright blue e'en closed and a' the colour

gane frae her cheek and lips, and her bonny lang gowden hair a' soakit and drippin' wi' the salt water.'"

There is another very pretty tale in the volume, the story of Ella, the deserted daughter of a proud, cold-hearted parent, who is at length subdued by calamity, and then the child assumes her natural place in a changed heart. But the finest tale in the book in our view is the "Miser's Daughter." The character here portrayed is really a nobly and affectingly imagined one: its great merit is the forgiveness of injuries, and the faith from which it springs. We have perused this tale with unmingled pleasure.

We might point out some other tales of high merit in this little volume, amongst which we would particularly specify "Birksghyll;" but the volume itself, edited as it is by the Vicar of Frome, in a pleasing preface, leads us to dwell for a little on certain recent events in which that editor has taken a prominent part. We have seen in the little volume before us some slight indications of a spirit which is but too prevalent in the present day, and which appear to be increasingly manifesting itself in some classes of society. The truth is, that all warnings and examples are thrown away on some persons, who appear to be totally incapable of opening their eyes to the signs of the times, and continue precisely in the same course of opinion and practice, no matter how far experience has shown the peril or the unsoundness of one or the other. The evil is a wide-spread one, nor is it easy to see a satisfactory remedy at present.

But to turn from such general reflections to the particular case which has led to them, we have been much pained by the whole of what has recently passed in relation to the Vicarage of Frome.

The recent debates and their results have been very much what we anticipated as likely to occur when we perused the Letter which was addressed to his parishioners by Mr. Bennett on his appointment. The disturbances in the diocese of London, in reference to the Church of St. Barnabas, had evinced so extreme an agitation in the public mind,—the impressions, whether correctly or incorrectly formed, which identified Mr. Bennett with Romanizing tenets and practices were so universal,—that it could not have been anticipated that his appointment to any other benefice in the Church of England should fail to excite jealousy and opposition. For ourselves we own that we were sincerely desirous to see him restored to the ministry of his Church, which he is so eminently qualified in many respects to adorn. We did not hesitate to express a desire that he should be so, when both public and private information led us to believe that his visit to the Continent had produced an alteration in his feelings towards Rome, and that he had returned a decided opponent of that cor-

rupt system. We felt assured that in this case he would declare his sentiments in such a way as would reassure the public mind, and that he would not hesitate to withdraw various expressions in his recent publications which had indicated an unsettled mind, and a want of fidelity to the Church of England. When his appointment to the Vicarage of Frome took place, almost immediately after his return, and when a strong local opposition to his appointment arose—a proceeding most natural and reasonable in itself—we felt assured that such an opportunity would not be lost,—that he would at once have stated his sentiments so explicitly in reference to Romanism, that the strongest ground of opposition would have been removed; and we did cherish a hope that reflection would have led to a humility of tone, a manifestation of conciliatory spirit, a withdrawal of offensive passages in former publications, and a pledge as to future moderation in ritual matters, which would have effectually prevented all further proceedings. But we unfortunately live in times when, by many earnest and well-meaning men, any evidence of humility, any confession of error, or of want of judgment or of discretion,—any yielding to the attacks of persons of a different party,—is regarded as an act of cowardice, baseness, and dereliction of principle. *Practical infallibility* is the ground too generally assumed; and a leader of party would as soon deny the Nicene Creed as admit that he has ever failed in any single respect to evince the soundest judgment, the best temper, or the purest and most irrefragable soundness of doctrine. In the abstract indeed men will admit their fallibility, but they will never allow that they have practically erred. There have been great men before now who did not hesitate to confess that they had made mistakes. Augustine, Fenelon, and John Wesley are instances of this candour; and we should have supposed, that by a Christian any such self-humiliation would be not unwillingly embraced. But we have watched the course of religious party in our own times, and seen little of this spirit. We have seen leaders of party, from Newman downwards, putting forth crude and undigested ideas, and maintaining them with as much obstinacy and pertinacity as if they were the very essentials of the Gospel. We have seen men investing their own theories of worship, and their own tastes in ritual and decoration, with the attributes of Catholic and unchangeable truth, in defence of which they must be prepared, if necessary, to go to any extremities, and which, if interfered with in any way, would necessitate their secession from the Church of England.

Such is the wilful and obstinate attachment of men to points of private taste or invention, which they identify with the imagined interests or honour of some party, that party being con-

sidered as in itself virtually infallible, and as constituting the only true Church, from which all persons of a different party are cut off, and are to be regarded as heretics. Now when this spirit and temper of mind prevails to any extent, it is not to be expected that peace can be restored. Perpetual collisions of the most violent nature are sure to occur, when men not merely differ in opinion on most important points, but when they have no charity, humility, or even toleration for others. There are certain old maxims and directions which it would be happy for us if leaders of party could bear in mind,—we allude to such words as these: “Take heed, lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak.” “If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth.” “Let no man seek his own, but every man another’s wealth.” “Whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.” We know, alas! but too well, that it is very easy to demonstrate that such directions do not apply to our own particular case in any given instance; yet it is undoubtedly the absence of the *spirit* indicated in such passages,—the *presence*, instead of the absence, of “bitterness, and wrath, and clamour, and evil speaking,” that causes and irritates divisions and contentions.

We cannot but state our own persuasion, that there is deep cause for humiliation in all this; and indeed we would go one step further, and say, that it cannot be expected that the Divine blessing should rest on any cause thus supported. Where there is so much of pride, passion, obstinacy, and uncharitableness, we must say that men are still “carnal,” and that such men are unfitted to be made instruments for promoting pure and undefiled religion. When party is led by men of this unbending obstinacy of character, and when it comes in contact with the national feeling, the results may be expected to be most formidable. In England, more especially, there is danger in thoroughly rousing the nation. If a religious party takes an attitude of fixed and determined opposition to the whole world around them,—if it is to come to a question of “Who is strongest?”—there can be but one result; that party will be driven out of the Church, and perhaps the Church itself may be remodelled on different principles of worship and government, so as for ever to exclude the possibility of that party finding entrance again. We believe that at the commencement of the disturbance on the Papal Aggression such a consummation was not far off. The question was, whether the national indignation should fall on a party within the Church, or on Romanism. Happily it took the latter direction; but we shall never cease to regard it as owing to the special Providence

of God, that at that time no organic changes were made in the Church of England by the Parliament. We conceive it as not improbable, that had there not been a strong Opposition, which was certain to take up the question of the Papal Aggression to promote their own political ends, the Ministry would have followed the course indicated in the Durham letter, and, directing the national anger towards a certain party in the Church, would have permitted the Aggression to take its own course unmolested. We have no deep confidence, we confess, in the sincerity of any political party in this case. Had they been in earnest *then*, they would scarcely now permit, as they are doing, the assembling of a Romish synod in defiance of the Queen's supremacy,—a synod intended for the purpose of ostentatiously carrying out that Aggression in all its details,—a synod which it was the avowed wish and intention of all parties, at the time of the Papal Aggression, to *prevent*.

But though we escaped on that occasion from any great changes in the Church of England, the danger is still within reach; and if, at any time, the Parliament and nation became irritated to the same degree as in 1850, the result indicated above might occur.

We would just point out the effects of an obstinate perseverance in party and non-essential practices, by a reference to the case of St. Barnabas. We really regret to be obliged to do so, but the whole case is a matter of notoriety. Well—here are the facts.—

Mr. Bennett introduced in his church a variety of observances which gave extreme offence to many persons. On being reported to the Bishop of London, they met his Lordship's disapprobation. The bishop endeavoured, in a correspondence continued for months, to induce Mr. Bennett to relinquish those observances. The latter refused, and informed the bishop that rather than consent to make any alteration, he would resign his parish. In the mean time the Papal Aggression takes place. The people, infuriated at it, and at all tendencies to Romanism, are scarcely restrained from destroying St. Barnabas's—a violent popular ferment is excited. Mr. Bennett will still not yield an iota; he writes to justify every thing, and to make his bishop responsible for all his proceedings. In self-defence the bishop calls on him to resign his parish, and publishes the correspondence. At the eleventh hour Mr. Bennett is *willing to give up* the observances which had caused all the uproar; but it is then too late. Now, if Mr. Bennett could have done at first what he was willing to do at last—if he had not shown the marvellous obstinacy and pertinacity which he did, there would have been no disturbance, and

he would have been at St. Barnabas's till now. If he had conceded in small things, he would have been able to pursue his own plans in greater things. The result was—he was driven from his church, purely by his own acts. His bishop was placed in a position of extreme obloquy, and even danger. And the public mind became irritated to the highest degree against Mr. Bennett's party and principles.

Such was the first act of the drama.

The second opens with the presentation of Mr. Bennett to the vicarage of Frome Selwood.

The opposite party get up petitions against his appointment, stating their specific grounds of objection, founded on extracts from his recent writings. The patron of the living refuses to attend to those requests. The presentation is hastened on. The bishop of the diocese is under a legal obligation to institute the presentee; but previously ascertains, by a personal examination, that his faith is sound, and that he does not hold Roman Catholic doctrines. Mr. Bennett then publishes a pastoral letter to his parishioners, in which, instead of removing objections by a statement of opinions opposed to Romanism, on specific grounds, he represents himself as a most persecuted man; blames his late bishop, justifies himself, defends all the passages which had been objected to; and winds up by requesting his parishioners to receive his instructions in a docile spirit, and to acquiesce in the alterations he intends to introduce, in opposition to their ideas and wishes. Some of the neighbouring clergy write to him for a contradiction of statements concerning his conduct abroad, which identified him with Romanism. No answer is returned. At this point the affair is brought before the House of Commons. A member of Parliament, whose main object is to assail the Church and its rulers, eagerly seizes the opportunity to throw discredit on the clergy and bishops, as undeserving of confidence. He makes such a statement of alleged facts as to Mr. Bennett's having been reconciled to the Church of Rome, that even the Government, reluctant as they evidently were, were obliged to undertake an inquiry into the case. There was plenty of time to contradict these statements. No—that would have been a concession—it was not done; instead of this an address was got up in support of Mr. Bennett, which, as we anticipated, has had the effect of increasing the opposition to him as a dangerous person. The inquiry took place; delay ensued. At length it was discovered that the Government could do nothing. The question was then brought forward again by the same member. When it became formidable in appearance, a tardy contradiction was given to the statements made by Mr. Horsman, relative to Mr. Bennett's

conduct abroad. A motion was made, notwithstanding, involving a censure on the venerable bishop who had instituted Mr. Bennett. That prelate has been exposed to every kind of insult, vituperation, and unjust surmise. It becomes necessary to plead his cause elaborately in the House of Commons. The Government is opposed to the interference of the House of Commons in such a question. Moderate men of all parties are opposed to it. Nevertheless, Mr. Horsman succeeds in carrying, by a large majority, the appointment of a committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the appointment at Frome—defeating Government! The result of the whole is—that an interference with a strictly ecclesiastical question has been thus undertaken by the House of Commons in a way unprecedented for more than two centuries; while at the same moment we observe, as a new feature, that candidates for representation in Parliament are availing themselves of the excitement, to come forward on the distinct *pledge* to put down a certain party in the Church.

Thus ends the *second* act of the drama.

We must say, matters proceed bravely. What will be the third act? and what will be the catastrophe?

Such are the effects of obstinacy, and resolution to make no concession. Mr. Horsman will doubtless sit in the next Parliament, and he will return to the subject, and pursue it with the instinct of a blood-hound, and he will have the House of Commons and the nation with him.

There is doubtless some great purpose being promoted by such movements as we have been referring to, and we may hope that good will be brought out of what is in itself much to be lamented. Without such a persuasion indeed, it would be difficult to avoid a species of despondency in contemplating the continued spread of Romanizing error, evidenced in the continued apostasy of clergy of the English Church, and in the strange way in which objects and purposes good in themselves are marred and disfigured by the same miserable tendency. For instance, that noble work of Miss Sellon at Plymouth, commenced and carried on in so beautiful a spirit of philanthropy and self-devotion, and in many respects deserving of all honour and sympathy, gradually assumes such a tone that it involves the bishop of the diocese, who had protected it, in the most serious difficulties, and necessitates his retirement from connexion with it. It gradually comes out that the whole system there adopted is essentially Roman Catholic. The “Superior” of that Society (a Roman Catholic term, by the way) is not aware, according to her own statement, whether the customs and system there adopted do or do not agree with those of Romanism; and we can very well imagine that she is not aware

of the particular points of agreement. The fact, we understand, is this, that the private Rules of that Society were "adapted" by a leading divine from those of the "Sisters of Charity" in France, in the same spirit in which other "adaptations" have been made. Of course, if this statement be correct, it may be very well conceived that the "Superior" of the "Sisters of Mercy" might not be fully aware of the similarity of observances and the identity of principle. Unfortunately, however, when the real nature of those observances comes out, they are perceived to be strongly impregnated with the Romanism in its most modern shape; and the House of Mercy at Plymouth appears to be, in all material points, a nunnery. It is also pretty clear that other institutions of a similar character, are in existence elsewhere.

It is very easy, of course, to say much in favour of these institutions, and to attempt their vindication against opponents; but it is not so easy to show that they are not Roman Catholic in many respects; and this is really the only point of importance in the eye of the Nation. Unhappily those institutions cannot be cleared of this deplorable imputation, and no one even seems to attempt it. The association of pious women for the purpose of promoting works of Charity would have been a most happy and desirable object, could it have been carried out in a right spirit; but it became from the commencement so mixed up with Romish tendencies and associations, that it is positively objectionable and dangerous as matters now are; and it has become the subject of general obloquy, instead of holding the place which in some respects it deserves.

We have been led to these reflections by the recent discussions on the Frome Vicarage. We apprehend that there is no prospect of the cessation or diminution of the contest of principles which is continually manifesting itself in such ways. We trust that there is still remaining a considerable portion of the Church which is desirous of maintaining a position independent of party, and which will moderate between extremes, and endeavour to preserve the institutions of the Church from mutilation or perversion by any party. But the continued struggle of a Romanizing party, and the secessions, and the consequent state of the public mind, give rise to serious thoughts for the future.

It almost seems as if it were in the purpose of Divine Providence to awaken this nation thoroughly to a sense of its duty and position as the great stronghold of Christian principle in opposition to Papal idolatry and error. In fact England is now the only country of any importance, in Europe, where Popery is not in absolute and intolerant ascendancy; we are rapidly returning to the days and principles of Philip II. and of Queen Eliza-

beth. A great, and, perhaps, final struggle between truth and error is going on ; and perhaps this great country is to be roused by the apostasy of a few of its more educated classes, and by the insolent aggressions of Romanism to be the mainstay of Christianity on earth. To us, we confess, the unanimous and indignant protest of this nation against the Papal Aggression was a solemn and impressive event—a great and unmistakeable evidence of the revival of the national spirit. That event proved that if statesmen and politicians have too often deviated from the right path, the people of England were not essentially changed. After such an unexampled manifestation of the national mind, and after the legislation which it compelled, we can no more feel that Indifferentism has gained the ascendancy in the national councils. As English Churchmen we feel that in the Act against the Papal Aggression the nation solemnly declared its resolution to stand by the national Church in its struggle with the Papacy. In that Act we received some compensation for the dereliction of sound principle which led to Emancipation in 1829, to the suppression of Protestant bishoprics in 1833, and to the endowment of Maynooth in 1845. The national voice, which had ineffectually opposed these false and evil steps, was at length heard, and its operation reversed the false political principles of the preceding twenty years. According to all present appearances, the progress of events is likely to combine the whole nation in one vast Protestant confederation, and to lead to the suppression of all minor differences.

ART. III.—*The Eclipse of Faith ; or, a Visit to a Religious Sceptic.*
London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1852.

ALTHOUGH the confession of such a conviction may expose us to the charge of bigotry, we are not ashamed to own, that, in our estimation, the root of modern infidelity must usually be sought in the heart, rather than in the head. It is far more frequently a self-sufficient and perverse habit of mind which urges men to contest the truth of Revelation—an unwillingness to submit to an external rule, the greater on the score of that rule's holiness and consequent inconvenience to the carnal will; a petty pride which refuses to be instructed, and cannot bear to be placed on a level, in spiritual matters, with childhood or with "ignorant old age;"—it is far more frequently, we repeat, a moral, or rather an immoral bias of this nature which makes men either sceptics or unbelievers, than it is an honest intellectual incapacity, or spiritual dimness of sight, which prevents their recognising the truth as it is in Jesus. Nevertheless, there may, doubtless, be such a thing as genuine and honest scepticism; though rarely, if ever, we suspect, without some hidden bias in the wrong direction, which *unconsciously* influences the mind of the doubter. It is certain that God's word rates unbelief as deadly sin; wherefore we have it on the authority of God the Holy Spirit, that the corrupt will in man is the main source of unbelief; and surely this consideration must be as applicable to our own days as it was to those of the Apostles; for if, on the one hand, miraculous testimony has been withdrawn, on the other the Christian evidences are incalculably more powerful and complete than they were at that early period.

It is not acuteness, for the more part, which renders men infidels, for nothing is more common than to find dulness and infidelity consort together—the ass and the serpent. That small pride which refuses to be instructed is compatible indeed with a certain quickness and flippant cleverness, but scarcely with very superior intellectual powers. Thus, though there are of course exceptions to the rule, the highest order of minds have usually bowed in homage to the God of Revelation. We can scarcely conceive of a Shakespeare or a Milton's rejecting the evidences of Christianity.

Nevertheless, the thing is possible; as the instances of two such men as Schiller and Goethe, to go no further, demonstrate

to us. In the latter of these cases, indeed, there was no direct intellectual negation of Christianity; despite the prevailing conventional infidelity of his countrymen, Goethe always avoided this, and evaded the question by the frail confession that he was too "bequem," too comfortable, to be an orthodox Christian; that the tenet of the necessity for repentance, in particular, was one to which he could by no means "accommodate his will." Schiller, on the other hand, though, doubtless, a great poet, was a far more conventional thinker; one, indeed, who very fairly represented the German popular mind of his day; it would have been a moral miracle, therefore, had he been enabled to pierce the mists of prejudice and accept dogmatic Christianity.

But setting aside the melancholy case of Germany—in our own country, at all events, the great majority of the most powerful intellects have ranged themselves on the side of Christianity. And in this our day, who are the leaders of the infidel movement? Men known as great thinkers, or possessed of any very high powers, or peculiar genius? Most assuredly not. The two most illustrious names that can be mentioned amongst the present assailants of dogmatic Christianity, we should say, are those of Miss Martineau and of Mr. Francis Newman; and these do not precisely carry that intellectual weight which would be calculated to make us tremble.

We cannot wonder, therefore, at the tone of quiet and subtle irony and ill-concealed contempt for our modern transcendentalists which pervades the very powerful work before us, entitled "*The Eclipse of Faith*," wherein the bat-like gaze of Infidelity is confronted with the light of Revelation's sun; for the "*Eclipse of Faith*" is in the ocular organs of the sceptical beholder, not in the disc of that glorious luminary. With careful courtesy, but at the same time with much and just severity, the author of this remarkable work castigates the folly and presumption of Francis Newman, Parker, Gregg, and their followers, and vindicates the intellectual impregnability of the Christian Revelation.

The scheme of the work is rather remarkable. An elderly man, himself an orthodox believer, in the main, but tending, it should seem, to reject the more distinctive principles of Churchmanship, writes to his brother, a missionary in one of the South Sea islands, giving him an account of the state of religious parties at home; first seeking to make the Romanizers ridiculous, and delivering some random hits in so doing, which might affect ourselves, and all who believe in the existence of a visible Catholic Church, and the reality of the priestly office, he then proceeds to canvass the notions and spirit of the present leaders of the infidel party, and this with more especial reference to his own nephew,

who, apart from their influence, however, has become a sceptic on his own score, and is far more consistent than these transcendental gentlemen in his doubts and negations. To this doubting nephew the Christian uncle pays a visit, and during his residence in the sceptic's dwelling he keeps a record of their conversations on religious subjects, for the benefit of his brother in Polynesia. One of the principal characters introduced, who may be considered the butt of the book, is a friend of the nephew, an enthusiastic and devoted follower of Mr. Newman; and the chief purpose of the work seems to be to prove that there is no legitimate halting-place betwixt absolute and orthodox Christianity and universal scepticism; and that the transcendental theism of Mr. Newman is peculiarly unreasonable, as well as not a little absurd.

As we devoted an article, not long ago, to the consideration of this very subject, "*Transcendental Theism*," we cannot now be expected to enter on it very fully. In truth, we do not think that such arguments and reasonings as Mr. Francis Newman's are worthy of repeated refutations. Nine times out of ten they refute themselves; and it is only giving a needless importance to such lucubrations to treat them with great seriousness, and discuss them frequently. The work being once discharged according to the best of our ability, we certainly should not have been likely to return to the subject, had we not been so exceedingly struck by much of the writing in this "*Eclipse of Faith*" as to feel anxious to call attention to its literary and theological merits, which are most remarkable.

We are not without a suspicion that a writer whose name may be said to be in bad odour with Churchmen generally, from his harsh and somewhat irreverent assault upon ancient Christianity in one of the most remarkable productions of our era, is also the author of the work before us. We mean, of course, the well-known Isaac Taylor. We may be mistaken, but we fancy that this peculiar lucidity of style—this elegance and happiness of phraseology—this boldness and vigour of conception, would not be easily found united in another writer of our day. However this may be, "*The Eclipse of Faith*" is indeed a powerful work; and we think our readers will be obliged to us for a few specimens by way of illustration of its singular merits. The Introduction, addressed to the missionary brother in the Pacific, is not the least characteristic portion of the work, and a long passage from it will be read, we are assured, with pleasure and interest:—

"'Infidelity!' you will say. 'Do you mean such infidelity as that of Collins and Bolingbroke, Chubb and Tindal?' Why, we have plenty of those sorts, too, and worse; but the most alarming infidelity

of the day, a bastard deism, in fact, often assumes a different form ; a form, you will be surprised to hear it, which embodies (as many say) the *essence* of genuine Christianity ! Yes ; be it known to you, that when you have ceased to believe all that is specially characteristic of the New Testament,—its history, its miracles, its peculiar doctrines,—you may still be a genuine Christian. Christianity is sublimed into an exquisite thing, called modern ‘spiritualism.’ The amount and quality of the infidel ‘faith’ are indeed pleasingly diversified, when you come to examine individual professors thereof ; but it is always based upon the principle, that man is a sufficient light to himself ; that his oracle is within, so clear, as either to supersede the necessity, some say even the possibility, of all external revelation in any ordinary sense of that term ; or, when such revelation is in some sense allowed, to constitute man the absolute arbiter of how much or how little of it is worthy to be received.

“ This theory we all perceive, of course, cannot fail to recommend itself by the well-known uniformity and distinctness of man’s religious notions, and the reasonableness of his religious practices ! We all know there has never been any want of a revelation ; of which you have doubtless had full proof among the idolatrous barbarians you foolishly went to enlighten and reclaim. I wish, however, you had known it fifteen years ago ; I might have had my brother with me still. It is certainly a pity that this internal revelation—the ‘absolute religion,’ *hidden*, as Mr. Theodore Parker felicitously phrases it, in *all* religions of all ages and nations, and so strikingly avouched by the entire history of the world—should render itself suspicious by little discrepancies in its own utterances among those who believe in it. Yet so it is. Compared with the rest of the world, few, at the best, can be got to believe in the sufficiency of the internal light, and the superfluity of all external revelation ; and yet hardly two of the ‘little flock’ agree. *It is the rarest little oracle ! Apollo himself might envy its adroitness in the utterance of ambiguities.* One man says that the doctrine of a future life is undoubtedly a dictate of the ‘religious sentiment,’ one of the few universal characteristics of *all* religion ; another declares his ‘insight’ tells him nothing of the matter ; one affirms that the supposed chief ‘intuitions’ of the ‘religious faculty,’ belief in the efficacy of prayer, the free will of man, and the immortality of the soul, are at hopeless variance with intellect and logic ; others exclaim, and surely not without reason, that this casts upon our faculties the opprobrium of irretrievable contradictions ! As for those ‘spiritualists,’—and they are perhaps at present the greater part,—who profess, in some sense, to pay homage to the New Testament, they are at infinite variance as to *how much*, whether $7\frac{1}{2}$, 30, or 50 *per cent.* of its records, is to be received. Very few get so far as the last. One man is resolved to be a Christian : none more so ; only he will reject all the peculiar doctrines, and all the supernatural narratives of the New Testament ; another declares that miracles are impossible and ‘incredible, *per se* ;’ a third thinks they are neither the

one nor the other, though it is true that probably a comparatively small portion of those narrated in the 'book,' are established by such evidence as to be worthy of credit. Pray use your pleasure in the selection; and the more freely, as a fourth is of opinion, that, however true, they are really of little consequence. While many extol in vague terms of admiration the deep 'spiritual insight' of the founders of Christianity, they do not trouble themselves to explain how it is that this exquisite illumination led them to concoct that huge mass of legendary follies and mystical doctrines which constitute, according to the modern 'spiritualism,' the bulk of the records of the New Testament, and by which its authors have managed to mislead the world; nor how we are to avoid regarding them either as superstitious and fanatical fools, or artful and designing knaves, if nine-tenths, or seven-tenths of what they receive is all to be rejected; nor, if it be affirmed that they never *did* record it, but that somebody else has put these matters into their mouths, how we can be sure that any thing whatever of the small remainder did come *out* of their mouths. All this, however, is of the less consequence, as these gentlemen condescend to tell us how we are to separate the 'spiritual' gold, which faintly streaks the huge mass of impure ore of fable, legend, and mysticism. *Each man, it seems, has his own particular spade and mattock in his 'spiritual faculty'; so off with you to the diggings, in these spiritual mines of Ophir!* You will say, Why not stay at home, and be content at once, with the advocates of the absolute sufficiency of the internal oracle, to listen to its responses exclusively? Ask these men, for I am sure I do not know; I only know that the results are not very different, whether the professor of 'insight' listens to its own rare voice, or puts on its spectacles, and reads aloud from the New Testament. Generally, as I say, these good folks are resolved that all that is supernatural and specially inspired in the Sacred Volume is to be rejected; and, as to the rest, which, by the way, might be conveniently published as the 'Spiritualist's Bible,' (in two or three sheets, 48mo say,) that would still require a careful winnowing; for, while one man tells us that the Apostle Paul, in his intense appreciation of the 'spiritual element,' made light even of the 'resurrection of Christ,' and every where shows his superiority to the beggarly elements of history, dogma, and ritual; another declares that he was so enslaved by his Jewish prejudices, and the trumpery he had picked up at the feet of Gamaliel, that he knew but little or next to nothing of the real mystery of the very Gospel he preached; that, while he proclaims that it is revealed, after having been hidden from ages and generations, he himself manages to hide it afresh. This, you will be told, is a perpetual process, going on even now; that, as all the earlier prophets were unconscious instruments of a purpose beyond their immediate range of thought, so the Apostles themselves similarly illustrated the shallowness of *their* range of thought; that, in fact, the true significance of the Gospel lay beyond them, and doubtless, also, for the very same reasons, lies beyond us. In other words, this class of spi-

ritualists tell us, that Christianity is a 'development,' as the Papists also assert, and the New Testament its first imperfect and rudimentary product; only, unhappily, as the developments, it seems, may be things so very different, as popery and infidelity, we are as far as ever from any *criterion* as to which, out of the ten thousand possible developments, is the true; but it is a matter of the less consequence, since it will, on such reasoning, be always something future."—pp. 9—13.

The justice of these comments on modern speculation will, we think, be recognized by all our readers; the wit is only too polished, the sarcasm only too refined. We confess that a more open expression of contempt would appear to us to suit the case of these transcendentalists better than this pure socratic irony. But surely, ridicule, whether refined or obstreperous, was never yet so well deserved by men; there never were reasoners so utterly extravagant; there never were pretended reasonings so preposterously self-contradictory. These laudations of Apostles and Evangelists on the lips of men who reject the whole body of their personal testimonies; these broadest of all possible assumptions, that the clearest of all writers never knew their own meaning; these arbitrary perversions of fact; these self-sufficient and gravely pompous reiterations of the same thousand-fold refuted sophisms, would surely afford a fitting theme for laughter only, were they not such melancholy instances of the perversity of the human will. But it seems impossible to convince these transcendental gentlemen how very sincerely we, bigoted orthodox believers of the old school, feel for and commiserate their wretched intellectual inconsistencies and weaknesses. On the contrary, they and their organs, "the Westminster" and "the Leader," go on repeating that Christians do not answer, or attempt to answer, their reasonings. Would they have us fight with the clouds? Would they have us scale a mountain of mist? Would they constrain us to be at enormous pains to demonstrate, what the common sense of human kind is fortunately apt to take for granted, that such a book as the Bible, written by such men, supported by such testimony, borne witness to by such lives and deaths, so marvellously self-consistent in small as great things, so plain in its historical records, blending those records every where so inextricably with direct supernatural teaching,—that such a book must be either a gigantic fiction, (which these men fear to proclaim it,) or else the very and eternal word of God; but that it cannot be half true, or a quarter true, cannot be a mere spiritual myth, cannot contain, from beginning to end, a series of fictitious narratives, and of sham prophecies, combined with the highest, and noblest, and purest doctrinal teaching? We have no patience with these preposterous theories. Give us such

an open enemy as "Voltaire," if you will; for we know how to deal with him; reproduce the objections to the Christian scheme, of Collins and Bolingbroke, Chubb and Tindal; they have been answered, and they can be answered fully; but do not deluge us with this wishy-washy flood of shadowy mysticism; do not adhere so scrupulously to Mephistopheles' advice to the student in "Faust," to stick to the use of words, and nothing but words, in his neology; do not obtrude upon us a system which seals its own condemnation, by basing itself on moral and intellectual impossibilities.

The author of "The Eclipse of Faith" is right in saying that an infidelity is yet rife among us of a more self-consistent order. Apart from the rhapsodical and transcendental "mesmeric atheism" of Miss Martineau and Mr. Atkinson, Tom Paine has yet his earnest followers, in men called Hetherington and Holioake, whose works enjoy a certain circulation, we regret to say, among the more educated of the working-classes, and thus pervert the minds of those who, in their turn, become the oracles of the beer-house and the tap-room. Our labourers would, indeed, be unable to enter into the refinements of Mr. Francis Newman's speculations; their mother-wit, we venture to affirm, would lead them to conclude, ere long, were they to peruse his spiritual lucubrations, that there was not much in him, or them: but this class of men is naturally caught by the jesting of the Voltaire school; and it requires no demonstration on our part, that there is much in the Old Testament, in particular, arising from the peculiar customs and manners of the East, which naturally lends itself to such treatment. The more refined class of infidels have been shamed, as it were, from this offensive line of argument, which professed to treat Christianity as a detected fraud, the invention of priestcraft for the subjugation of the human intellect. Very few educated men would now venture to reiterate the reasonings of a Voltaire and his royal pupil Frederick. The moral grandeur, the æsthetic beauty of the Christian Revelation are admitted; and this very admission is fatal to the cause of infidelity. But a class of writers yet exists who adopt the old weapons of sarcasm and hate, and exercise no little influence over the minds of the half-educated.

The remarks respecting "Development," with which our author terminates the passage we have just quoted, are well followed up by him, after this fashion:—

"Between many of our modern 'spiritualists' and the Romanists there is a parallelism of movement absolutely ludicrous. You may chance to hear both declaiming, with equal fervour, against 'intellect'

and 'logic' as totally incompetent to decide on 'religious' or 'spiritual truth,' and in favour of a 'faith' which disclaims all alliance with them. You may chance to hear them both insisting on an absolute submission to an 'infallible authority' other than the Bible: the one external—that is, the Pope; the other internal—that is, 'spiritual insight;' both exacting absolute submission, the one to the outward oracle, the Church; the other to the inward oracle, himself; both insisting that the Bible is but the first imperfect product of genuine Christianity, which is perfected by a 'development,' though as to the direction of that development they certainly do *not* agree. Both, if I may judge by some recent speculations, recoil from the Bible even more than they do from one another; and both would get rid of it—one by locking it up, and the other by tearing it to tatters. Thus receding in opposite directions round the circle, they are found placed side by side at the same extremity of a diameter, at the *other* extremity of which is the—Bible. The resemblances, in some instances, are so striking, that one is reminded of that little animal, the fresh-water *polype*, whose external structure is so absolutely a mere prelongation of the internal, that you may turn him inside out, and all the functions of life go on just as well as before."—p. 14.

It has often struck us that an interesting parallel might be drawn, from a similar point of view to this, between John Henry and Francis William Newman; and we have even thought of devoting a special article to the subject. In both of these remarkable men, though indeed the elder brother possesses far higher intellectual powers, more depth of thought, more subtlety, more imagination, and more genius,—yet in both we recognize the same tendency to bold and far-reaching, nay, audacious speculation; the same love for arbitrary system-making; the same capacity for seeing only one side of any matter at a time; the same apparent inability to weigh any question in fair and equal scales; we fear we must add, the same perversity of will. In Francis Newman's mind we fancy that we recognize more natural softness and gentleness; yet there is a dogged stubbornness about him also, which somehow makes one almost hopeless of his ever opening his eyes to discern the truth. Both of these thinkers manifestly pride themselves on their presumed originality of thought; on borrowing little or nothing from external sources: their minds are possessed with so-called fixed ideas, which are more or less unreasonable, and upon these, with much perverse ingenuity, they construct their respective theological edifices. Both agree in believing that the Apostolic Church understood its own tenets far less distinctly than they do; both agree in making their own judgments the ultimate arbiters of the wisdom of all the ages, and in rejecting all evidence which is opposed to their views from

the earlier days of Christianity as necessarily inconclusive, because their theory of development was then not known to the world. In fine, we imagine that we trace a strong family resemblance between these brothers, both in point of theory and of practice; and, unless we are much mistaken, we should not greatly err in tracing their respective aberrations from the right path to the influence, in either case, of a diseased self-will!

Meanwhile the parallel drawn by our author holds, beyond a doubt, at all points; though we suspect that it will be equally unwelcome to the votaries of "the pure Theism" (Heaven save the mark!) and the usurpers of the authority and glory of Catholicism.

But we are advancing too slowly in our general survey of the work before us, and find that we must make few and brief quotations, and, as far as possible, avoid digressions, if we would convey any general notion of its bearings to our readers. The good Christian, then, who writes the book, visits his sceptical nephew Harrington, a young man of nine-and-twenty, who, under the influence, as it would seem, of German infidelity and of some great disappointment in life, has become a confirmed sceptic, doubting even what he doubts. He is described as amiable, and any thing but happy in his unbelief, being very anxious to solve to his own satisfaction the riddle of the universe. It does not appear that he rejects historical Christianity on any distinctive grounds whatever; he does not *disbelieve* its truth; he inclines far rather to accept the theories of orthodoxy than those of modern spiritualism: but still he is not *convinced*. Certain difficulties remain which Christianity cannot clear up for him, and he would have these solved as well; the evidence is strong, but it might be stronger: in fine, it seems wiser, and more natural to him, to wait.

Such seems to be the state of Harrington's mind; and his is probably no uncommon case in the present day. The necessity for making some choice is urged upon this sceptic vainly; he is entreated without avail fairly to weigh the evidences for Christianity with its difficulties: he can arrive at no conclusion; he wanders, lost in the maze of doubt. We suspect that in all such cases as this, the impediment to the reception of truth must reside in some unconscious bias of the will, some secret unwillingness to receive Divine instruction, the product of the vanity of human nature. However this may be, Harrington is exhibited to us as peculiarly severe on the monomaniac fantasies of his spiritualist friend Fellowes, and most satisfactorily does he refute the leading positions of that gentleman's mystical neology.

Then the theory of the impossibility of any revelation by means of a book, which theory itself purports to be a revelation of the Divine will and nature made *in a book*, this grotesque assumption, that God cannot do what man obviously can, is canvassed with a mock solemnity which must be peculiarly edifying to all "spiritualists," and finally devoted to the limbo of vanity with a reluctant tenderness and grave politeness, which can scarcely fail to elicit an orthodox chuckle from the most Christian students of this book. Then the absurdity of holding up these very men as the highest models for saintliness, whose word you will not take for the very simplest matter of fact, is exposed at no slight length. The singular tenacity with which Mr. Newman and his followers cling to scriptural phraseology for the purpose of demonstrating that their own inspiration is wholly independent of Scripture sources, and far transcends its writer's meaning, is also very happily castigated. The Apostles are defended from the imputation of wishing to inculcate a contempt for this life, when properly understood, with great success; in fact, the section which contains this argument (from p. 57 to 67) is, perhaps, one of the most valuable in the volume. The infallibility of the spiritual insight, sufficient, as these gentlemen declare, without any external revelation, to illuminate the hearts and minds of men, is handled not over reverently by the sceptical Harrington; and, in fine, so thoroughly exposed in all its grossness of absurdity, that we almost wonder how any educated man could persist in the utterance of such transparent fallacies, of such monstrously incredible assumptions, supposing him to have perused this book. The theory that true faith is altogether independent of belief, a mere mystical instinct having nothing to do with facts, is also very satisfactorily demolished (p. 106 to 118). The difficulties of "pure Theism" (so called) are shown to be fully as great, nay, far greater, than those of Christianity: for Christianity *does* supply a solution of the enigma of the universe, shows us how the possibility of evil was necessitated by freedom, and reconciles God's justice with His mercy; whilst the mere theist is utterly at a loss to account for the moral and physical mysteries and miseries he beholds around them; cannot at all reconcile them, indeed, with his idea of a Deity of pure abstract benevolence. Then we are introduced to a select party at a sceptic's table, consisting of infidels of various classes, the more downright and the spiritual, a so-called deist of the old English school having by far the most sense among the party, two Roman Catholics, Harrington, and the author; and the conflict of heretical and infidel opinions, elicited, among themselves, is not a little amusing. Then the author traces the

history of his own religious growth in a long section headed "Dilemmas of an Infidel Neophyte," and shows how reason finally constrained him to take refuge from the manifest self-contradictions of infidelity in the bosom of orthodox Christianity; how the difficulties attendant on the rejection of such a revelation appeared to him immeasurably greater than those which attended its acceptance, and were, indeed, altogether insuperable in his eyes. The question of miracles is also treated happily; and the reasonable conclusion is arrived at, that they must be entirely a matter of evidence, and that to argue from the fact of our ordinary experience against miracles that they cannot exist, as Hume did of old, is equally dishonest and unreasonable; the true appeal lying to the observation not of any one individual or generation, but to the universal experience of man, a part of which experience is that very evidence which guarantees the truth of the miracles to us: for it is surely plain enough that if the miracles were not exceptional they would not be miracles at all. In fine, our author demonstrates that the objection can reasonably take no other form than this: that God could not suspend the laws which He had once laid down; this assertion being manifestly a gross assumption, a mere *petitio principii*. The folly of scepticism carried out to its legitimate extent is happily illustrated by aid of Archbishop Whately's admirable "Historic Doubts;" and a very amusing sceptical paper is given us on the same model, with the view of proving, on the authority of some New Zealand philosopher, in the year 4000, that the papal aggression was a myth; this circumstance being demonstrated with no little show of reason by the said philosopher, who builds his chief argument on the nature of the names of the chief actors in that theological drama, two of which, more especially (Wiseman and Newman), bear, according to him, the most indisputable evidence of their purely allegorical significance. Then we have another very amusing essay, somewhat in the style of the "Spectator" on the "Paradise of Fools," in which creatures are introduced to us as being allowed to found their own systems of creation, and to form their revelations by some peculiar process which appears more satisfactory to them than that which has been adopted by the Creator. We refer our readers to the pages of "The Eclipse of Faith" for this instructive and interesting paper, and shall confine ourselves to one more, but necessarily a long citation, which, we trust, will please them almost, if not quite, as much as it delights ourselves. It forms the opening of a most admirable narrative essay, entitled "The Blank Bible," an essay, which, in our judgment, equals Addison's lucubrations, as to elegance of style, and surpasses them in originality of thought and depth of feeling. It will make,

we trust, a pleasant sequel to this somewhat heavy article, being calculated at once to interest and instruct. Here, then, follows this happy narrative, thus briefly introduced by our author :

"The discussions of the preceding day had made so deep an impression upon me, that when I went to bed I found it very difficult to sleep; and when I did get off at last, my thoughts shaped themselves into a singular dream, which, though only a dream, is not, I think, without instruction. I shall entitle it

"THE BLANK BIBLE.

"Ἐλῆν γεγωνεῖν νυκτίφοιτ' ὄνειρατα.

Æschyl. Prom. Vinc. 657.

"I thought I was at home, and that on taking up my Greek Testament one morning to read (as is my wont) a chapter, I found, to my surprise, that what seemed to be the old familiar book was a total blank; not a character was inscribed in it or upon it. I supposed that some book like it had, by some accident, got into its place; and, without stopping to hunt for it, took down a large quarto volume which contained both the Old and New Testaments. To my surprise, however, this also was a blank from beginning to end. With that facility of accommodation to any absurdities, which is proper to dreams, I did not think very much of the coincidence of two blank volumes having been substituted for two copies of the Scriptures in two different places, and therefore quietly reached down a copy of the Hebrew Bible, in which I can just manage to make out a chapter. To my increased surprise, and even something like terror, I found that this also was a perfect blank. While I was musing on this unaccountable phenomenon, my servant entered the room, and said that thieves had been in the house during the night, for that her large Bible, which she had left on the kitchen table, had been removed, and another volume left by mistake in its place, of just the same size, but made of nothing but white paper. She added, with a laugh, that it must have been a very queer kind of thief to steal a Bible at all; and that he should have left another book instead, made it the more odd. I asked her if any thing else had been missed, and if there were any signs of people having entered the house? She answered in the negative to both these questions; and I began to be strangely perplexed.

"On going out into the street I met a friend, who, almost before we had exchanged greetings, told me that a most unaccountable robbery had been committed at his house during the night, for that every copy of the Bible had been removed, and a volume of exactly the same size, but of pure white paper, left in its stead. Upon telling him that the same accident had happened to myself, we began to think that there was more in it than we had at first surmised.

"On proceeding further, we found every one complaining in similar

perplexity of the same loss ; and before night it became evident that a great and terrible 'miracle' had been wrought in the world ; that in one night, silently, but effectually, that hand which had written its terrible menace on the walls of Belshazzar's palace, had reversed the miracle ; had spunged out of our Bibles every syllable they contained, and thus reclaimed the most precious gift which Heaven had bestowed, and ungrateful man had abused.

"I was curious to watch the effects of this calamity on the varied characters of mankind. There was universally, however, an interest in the Bible now it was *lost*, such as had never attached to it while it was *possessed* ; and he who had been but happy enough to possess fifty copies might have made his fortune. One keen speculator, as soon as the first whispers of the miracle began to spread, hastened to the depositories of the Bible Society, and the great book-stocks in Paternoster-row, and offered to buy up at a high premium any copies of the Bible that might be on hand ; but the worthy merchant was informed that there was not a single copy remaining. Some, to whom their Bible had been a 'blank' book for twenty years, and who would never have known whether it was full or empty had not the lamentations of their neighbours impelled them to look into it, were not the least loud in their expressions of sorrow at this calamity. One old gentleman, who had never troubled the book in his life, said it was 'confounded hard to be deprived of his *religion* in his old age ;' and another, who seemed to have lived as though he had always been of Mandeville's opinion, that 'private vices were public benefits,' was all at once alarmed for the *morals* of mankind. He feared, he said, that the loss of the Bible would have 'a *cursed* bad effect on the public virtue of the country.'

"As the fact was universal and palpable, it was impossible that, like other miracles, it should leave the usual loopholes for scepticism¹. Miracles in general, in order to be miracles at all, have been singular, or very rare violations of a general law, witnessed by a few, on whose testimony they are received, and on the reception of whose testimony consists the exercise of that faith to which they appeal. It was evident that, whatever the reason of *this* miracle, it was not an exercise of humble and docile faith founded on evidence no more than just sufficient to operate as a moral test. This was a miracle, which, it could not be denied, looked marvellously like a 'judgment.' However, there were, in some cases, indications enough to show how difficult it is to give such evidence as will satisfy the obstinacy of mankind. One old sceptical fellow, who had been for years bed-ridden, was long in being convinced (if, indeed, he ever was), that any thing extraordinary had

¹ We have no doubt, however, that our neighbours the Germans would devise some ingenious theory even in such a case ; for there is no limit to the perverse ingenuity of man in general, and of German man in particular. It would be probably maintained that some novel law had come into operation which in course of time would assuredly extend its effects to all other ancient books in their order of rotation ; the Bible preceding Hesiod and Homer only since it claimed the more remote antiquity.

occurred in the world: he at first attributed the reports of what he heard to the 'impudence' of his servants and dependents, and wondered that they should dare to venture upon such a joke. On finding these assertions backed by those of his acquaintance, he pished, and pshawed, and looked very wise, and ironically congratulated them on this creditable conspiracy with the insolent rascals, his servants. On being shown the Old Bible, of which he recognized the binding, though he had never seen the inside, and finding it a very fine book of blank paper, he quietly observed that it was very easy to substitute the one book for the other, though he did not pretend to divine the motives which induced people to attempt such a clumsy piece of imposition; and on their persisting that they were not deceiving him, swore at them as a set of knaves, who would fain persuade him out of his senses. On their bringing him a pile of blank Bibles, backed by the asseverations of other neighbours, he was ready to burst with indignation. 'As to the volumes,' he said, 'it was not difficult to procure a score or two of 'common-place books,' and they had doubtless done so to carry on the cheat; for himself, he would sooner believe that the whole world was leagued against him than credit any such nonsense.' They were angry in their turn at his incredulity, and told him that he was very much mistaken if he thought himself of so much importance that they would all perjure themselves to delude him, since they saw plainly enough that he could do that very easily for himself, without any help of theirs. They really did not care one farthing whether he believed them or not: if he did not choose to believe the story, he might leave it alone. 'Well, well,' said he, 'it is all very fine, but unless you show me, not one of those blank books, which could not impose upon any one, but one of the *very blank Bibles themselves*, I will not believe.' At this curious demand, one of his nephews, who stood by (a lively young fellow), was so excessively tickled, that though he had some expectations from the sceptic, he could not help bursting out into laughter; but he became grave enough when his angry uncle told him that he would leave him in his will nothing but the family Bible, which he might make a ledger of if he pleased. Whether this resolute old sceptic ever vanquished his incredulity, I do not remember.

"Very different from the case of this sceptic was that of a most excellent female relative, who had been equally long a prisoner to her chamber, and to whom the Bible had been, as to many thousands more, her faithful companion in solitude, and the all-sufficient solace of her sorrows. I found her gazing intently on the blank Bible, which had been so recently brought to her, with the lustre of immortal hopes. She burst into tears as she saw me. 'And has your faith left *you* too, my gentle friend?' said I. 'No,' she answered; 'and I trust it never will. He who has taken away the Bible has not taken away my memory; and I now recall all that is most precious in that book which has so long been my meditation. It is a heavy judgment upon the land; and surely,' added this true Christian, never thinking of the faults of others, 'I, at least, cannot complain, for I have not prized, as

I ought, that book, which yet, of late years, I think I ~~can~~ say, I loved more than any other possession on earth. But I know,' she continued, smiling through her tears, 'that the sun shines, though clouds may veil him for a moment; and I am unshaken in my faith in those truths which have been transcribed on my memory, though they are blotted from my book. In these hopes I have lived, and in these hopes I will die.' 'I have no consolation to offer to you,' said I, 'for you need none.' She quoted many of the passages which have been, through all ages, the chief stay of sorrowing humanity; and I thought the words of Scripture had never sounded so solemn or so sweet before. 'I shall often come to see you,' I said, 'to hear a chapter in the Bible, for you know it far better than I.'

"No sooner had I taken my leave, than I was informed that an old lady of my acquaintance had summoned me in haste. She said she was much impressed by this extraordinary calamity. As, to my certain knowledge, she had never troubled the contents of the book, I was surprised that she had so taken to heart the loss of that which had, practically, been lost to her all her days. 'Sir,' said she, the moment I entered, 'the Bible! the Bible!' 'Yes, madam,' said I, 'this is a very grievous and terrible visitation. I hope we may learn the lessons which it is calculated to teach us.' 'I am sure,' answered she, 'I am not likely to forget it for awhile, for it has been a grievous loss to me.' I told her I was very glad. 'Glad!' she rejoined. 'Yes,' I said, 'I am glad to find that you think it so *great* a loss, for that loss may then be a gain indeed. There is, thanks be to God! enough left in our memories to carry us to heaven.' 'Ah! but,' said she, 'the hundred pounds, and the villany of my maid-servant! Have you not heard?' She then told me that she had deposited several bank notes in the leaves of her family Bible, thinking that, to be sure, nobody was likely to look *there* for them. 'No sooner,' said she, 'were the Bibles made useless by this strange event, than my servant peeped into every copy in the house, and she now denies that she found any thing in my old family Bible, except two or three blank leaves of thin paper, which, she *says*, she destroyed; that if any characters were on them they must have been erased, when those of the Bible were obliterated. But I am sure she lies; for who would believe that Heaven took the trouble to blot out my poor bank notes? *They* were not God's word, I trow.' It was clear that she considered the 'promise to pay' better by far than any promises which the book contained. 'I should not have cared so much about the Bible,' she whined, hypocritically, 'because, as you truly observe, our memories may retain enough to carry us to heaven'—a little in that case would certainly go a great way, I thought to myself—'and if not, there are those who can supply the loss. But who is to get my bank notes back again? Other people have only lost their Bibles.' It was indeed a case beyond my powers of consolation."—pp. 229—236.

We break off our long quotation here, though unwillingly, for what follows is equally admirable, both in conception and execution.

We are told how a search was made in all books for quotations from the Sacred Volume ; how these were all found to be erased ; and what a melancholy hiatus was thereby occasioned, not only in the department of divinity, but also in almost all the greatest modern authors, Shakespeare and Walter Scott being particularized. At last it is discovered, that by aid of the memories of students of the Bible, of all classes, it may be possible to reproduce that invaluable treasure ; and a committee of theologians is accordingly appointed to superintend this all-important undertaking. How the work progresses, we cannot pause to tell ; from what human sources various characteristic passages are derived, and what differences and disputes arise among the committee ; much of the genuine humour of our author would naturally display itself here. He does not fail to tell us that the Papists considered the attempt to reconstruct the Sacred Volume as all but impious, the Almighty being so manifestly pleased to abandon the Church to the supreme and infallible guidance of the Bishop of Rome ; while the transcendental infidel aimed, as a matter of course, at the same result, though by a different road, being satisfied that Providence had removed the "book" in compassion, not to interfere with the dictates of "spiritual insight," and as a species of rebuke to man's unfortunately "rampant Bibliolatry."

The conclusion of the work is scarcely as satisfactory, perhaps, in point of narrative, as might have been desired ; and yet the last interview of the Christian and the sceptic has very great beauty, and the general effect of the book is likely, we should say, to be exceedingly salutary among all classes of readers ; but especially, of course, among those who are infected with the quasi-philosophy of so-called spiritualism. The title has been judiciously selected, we should imagine, so as to attract, if possible, this very class, and we trust that this writer's voice may reach where ours, perhaps, would not. He has discharged a very noble office with great ability. His book is replete with acute reasoning, and studded with powerful bursts of eloquence ; many passages possess a calm and sacred beauty which must delight the taste and conciliate the affections of the reader ; and, last not least, wit and humour abound, and ridicule is most felicitously employed for the signal discomfiture of mischievous neology. We wish the author God speed, and congratulate him on the successful achievement of his work.

ART. IV.—*The Church of Christ, in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry : with a particular reference to the Controversy on the subject between Romanists and Protestants.* By EDWARD ARTHUR LITTON, M.A., *Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.* London : Longman. pp. xxxi. 701. 800.

It is our purpose in the following pages to state as fairly as we can the leading features of the important work before us, and to offer such comments, either in the way of assent or dissent, as we may deem requisite for the interests of Christian truth. We would state in the outset our persuasion that few works of our own times merit a more careful and impartial examination, whether we consider the deep importance of the subject, its especial bearing on the circumstances of the present day, or the thoughtful and philosophical spirit in which it is discussed. A work exhibiting such remarkable powers, both natural and acquired, evincing so unusual a grasp and vigour of mind in dealing with questions of the most intricate and subtle character, ought to receive the amplest consideration, and will, we doubt not, contribute to modify various theories which are afloat in the present day. It is true that Mr. Litton maintains some views which will by many persons be deemed untenable, unsound, and even dangerous. He will be set down as an ultra-Low Churchman—a species of heretic, perhaps, by many earnest-minded men. His views on episcopacy and on baptism will be pointed out as sufficient to condemn him at once, as unworthy of a hearing. But we think it would be a great mistake to permit certain errors on these points to exclude him from a fair hearing on other points of at least equal importance. A writer who gives to the world the result of deep research and of patient thought, and who produces a theory or a view extremely different from that to which we are accustomed, and a theory or view which is backed by a considerable amount of authority, certainly does deserve from all conscientious lovers of the truth, a fair and candid hearing. The subject of Mr. Litton's work is the Church of Christ. This is a subject which is fairly open to inquiry and discussion. It may be indeed supposed, and it evidently is believed by many persons, that the question of the Church is one on which no difference of opinion can be tolerated, and in which any theory or any point different from that which we ourselves maintain, is to be regarded

as uncatholic, or absolutely heretical. Now the fact is, that persons who think in this way, have, for the most part, not thought and reasoned out the Church system for themselves. They have received it merely on trust from others. They find certain texts, and certain authorities, and certain arguments adduced in favour of certain views; and being unable to see how such arguments can be met, they yield perhaps in implicit obedience and in absolute faith to what is set before them. And yet if those persons had been themselves possessed of time, or attainments, or capacity sufficient to have enabled them to investigate the truth on these particular points for themselves, they would not have arrived at the absolute conviction that those truths are infallibly revealed in God's word, but would have been only enabled to state their views as sound, and reasonably probable, and supported by adequate proofs and authorities.

It is a great evil that an author who conscientiously inquires after truth, and who places before his reader that which he is himself satisfied to be truth, as far as the infirmity of human judgment permits him to see, is unable to convey to the reader any experience of the *process* which his own mind has gone through in arriving at certain results, or the precise amount of authority which he attaches to those conclusions. He adduces proofs, and he refutes objections, and the fact of his doing so successfully amounts often, in his reader's mind, to a positive demonstration, when it does not quite reach to that point in his own mind. To his reader, the point in question becomes an article of faith, while to the writer, perhaps, it is never more than a high probability, or a sound, and reasonable, and well-founded opinion. Hence disciples are sometimes far more dogmatic and intolerant than their teachers.

It must be remembered, too, that writers are not only liable to mistakes through infirmity of judgment, but that they are sometimes biassed by some other objects than a simple desire to state the truth. We now speak of even conscientious and good men, who would not willingly state what is untrue, or conceal what is true; and yet such writers will sometimes be influenced, and not unnaturally, by a wish to uphold institutions or theories which they believe to be necessary and sacred; and their views on certain points are more or less influenced by their bearing on practical questions. Not that any conscious dishonesty is committed, but that the view which is most favourable to what we seek to maintain, is taken, perhaps in error, yet with a good intention.

Now the questions concerning the Church are to a great extent the subjects of theological argument: it is true indeed that

they are all founded on Scripture: but different views may be taken of Scripture; and there are a variety of positions and statements which are not expressly and clearly stated in God's word, but gathered from some principle or example supposed to be more or less clearly laid down there. Many of the tenets which we hold in general on such topics are consistent with different views. For instance, the unity of the Church is equally professed by a Roman Catholic, a High Churchman, and a latitudinarian. Yet the theories are very different. Unity is, to one, the communion with Peter's chair; to another, it is communion with the episcopate and with bishops; to others, it is a spirit of harmony. Sanctity is very differently interpreted, and is connected with disputed theological principles. Again, very different views may be taken of the visibility and the perpetuity of the Church, many of which are supported by scriptural arguments of no inconsiderable weight. The fact is, that people very commonly do not appreciate the difficulties of the subject, but leave out of view what may be urged in favour of theories different from their own. The most momentous differences on this subject arise sometimes from the mere fact of the different degrees of *prominence* given in different systems to doctrines held more or less in common. Here we would cite some remarks from the work before us:—

"If it should seem strange to the reader that a mere relative difference in the mode of viewing the same object should give rise to systems of very opposite character, he has only to remember that most of the errors that have appeared in the Church, both in past and present times, have arisen from giving an undue prominence to what is in itself an undoubted truth. Thus Arian tendencies spring from dwelling too exclusively upon the humanity of Christ; while the opposite error of the Docetæ, which manifested itself under so many forms in the first two centuries, may be traced to a similar exclusiveness of view with respect to the divinity. Sabellianism took its rise from not counterbalancing the declarations of the Old Testament respecting the Unity of God, with the equally clear statements of the New Testament respecting the Trinity in Unity. Certain declarations of St. Paul on the subject of justification, misunderstood, have led to Antinomianism; certain others of St. James, taken alone, have given rise to a type of sentiment equally erroneous. By taking too exclusive a view of the agency of Divine grace in the work of conversion, Calvin was led to make rash statements on the subject of predestination; by unduly magnifying man's part in that work, anti-Calvinists have verged towards Pelagianism."—pp. 77, 78.

This is undoubtedly a true statement on the whole; and it shows very distinctly the facility with which we fall into error, even while we maintain truth, by simply disturbing the equilibrium of doctrines in the Gospel.

Mr. Litton is of opinion that the leading mistakes in the Roman Catholic view of the Church, and in certain other theories on the same subject, is that they give an undue and exclusive preponderance to the external aspect of the Church, and omit its more purely theological idea, its universal and essential characteristics. It is not, he observes, that this essence and idea of the Church is denied for the most part, but it is held confusedly : it is not appreciated : it is overlooked. Now we must concede to some extent the truth of this statement. It is very clear that the theories of the Church we usually meet with are defective in this point ; nor indeed do we remember to have seen the importance of regarding the Church in its inward, spiritual, and essential character, so forcibly put as in the work before us. It proceeds on principles which are undeniable in regarding the Church in its essence as a communion of saints ; and we are indebted to it for views of the Church in this respect, which are of the highest importance, and which, in our judgment, are calculated to throw much new light on the whole question, and to solve various difficulties.

The preface states in general the plan of the work, as follows :—

“ The arrangement adopted may be briefly stated. In the first book an attempt is made to fix the true idea of the Church—that is, to determine whether it is, as the Romanist would have it, primarily an external institution ; or, as Protestantism teaches, a society which has its true being or differentia within. If the discussion should here seem unnecessarily extended, it must be remembered that this question lies at the very root of the controversy, and, moreover, is not often discussed by our own divines in a satisfactory manner. The second book is devoted to the consideration of the predicates or attributes of the Church, as expressed in the Catholic creeds, and in the rival confessions. The third book contains an exposition of the differences between us and Rome on the subject of the Christian ministry.”—pp. x. xi.

Mr. Litton remarks that the controversy on the Church owes its origin to the great religious movement of the sixteenth century, when opposite principles on this subject, which had been held for a long series of ages, were brought into collision by the force of circumstances. The view which represents the sentiments of Luther and Melancthon, and the Protestant confessions, as unknown amongst Christians previously to the Reformation, is, in his opinion, erroneous ; and it is demonstrable that the Protestant notion of the Church was held by Jerome, Augustin, Tertullian, and others, though, in various instances, simultaneously with principles of a different nature. But the inconsistency of these views was not perceived until the peculiar circumstances

of the Reformation at length drew it forth ; the plea of infallibility, set up in defence of the otherwise indefensible sale and doctrine of indulgences, and the controversy to which it gave rise, elicited the great principle of Protestantism—the supreme authority of Scripture in matters of faith. The opposing systems became fixed in the Protestant confessions, chiefly derived from the Confession of Augsburg, and in the decrees of the Tridentine Synod. In the one system, the leading principle or position on which all others depend, is the doctrine of justification by faith ; in the latter, the first principle is that of the authority of the Church, from which every other tenet or principle of Romanism follows. The peculiar circumstances of the times renders it incumbent, however, on Protestant writers who would meet effectually the difficulties of the case, to enter at once into the question of the Church. The plan pursued is, to refer to the authoritative confessions of the opposite parties. Mr. Litton refrains from referring to the Holy Scriptures as an authentic source whence we are to derive our knowledge of Romanism and Protestantism respectively. We must cite the following sensible remarks on this subject :—

“ It will be obvious, on a moment’s reflection, that Scripture is not, directly, one of these sources. Scripture is the common treasure of all Christians ; the common record which both parties recognize, and wherein each thinks it discovers the peculiarities of its own system. For no Romanist has as yet advanced so far as to admit that Scripture is opposed to the doctrines of his Church ; at most, he maintains that it is an imperfect, or an obscure, record of the Christian faith, and needs the aid of tradition, or development, to supply its deficiencies. Scripture, too, from its structure, and from the place which it holds, or ought to hold, in the Church, is manifestly unfitted, as it was never intended, to furnish us with dogmatical expositions of the Christian faith, much less of the faith of any party in the Church. The Church had her faith within, and could have given expression to it, before the New Testament was written :—the latter was added, to be a perpetual touchstone, or standard, whereby she is to try her faith, and correct any deviations which it may exhibit from the spirit of Apostolic Christianity. Scripture, therefore, is not a protest against certain specific errors, whether Romanist or Protestant, but against all forms of error, which may, to the end of time, prevail in the Church. The very place of supremacy which the Word of God holds in the Church, unfits it to be the symbol of any party :—it presents a record not so much of what the Church does, as of what she ought to, believe ; it exhibits the pure pattern of Apostolic Christianity, to which all Churches should endeavour to conform themselves. The Protestant, therefore, will search in vain in Scripture for a dogmatical exposition of the points in which he differs from the Church of Rome, just as he will in vain search there for a

categorical expression of his faith, as it is opposed to Arian and Socinian errors. Both in the one case and in the other, he will feel himself bound to *prove* from Scripture what he holds as matter of faith, but he cannot, as a Protestant or as a Trinitarian, take Scripture immediately, and say, This is an exposition of what I believe. It is also to be remembered, that, to claim Scripture directly as a record of what we hold in opposition to Romanism, is, not only to detract from the sacredness of the inspired writings, but to affirm that we have succeeded in reproducing amongst ourselves a perfect representation of Apostolic purity, both in doctrine and practice; an assumption which we are not justified in making. To be continually approximating to the idea of a Church presented in Scripture is our bounden duty; but it is not permitted us to say that we have actually reached that ideal; for this would be equivalent to making the imperfections under which our system may be labouring part of Scripture itself. We must carefully limit the sense of the celebrated aphorism, 'The Bible alone is the religion of Protestants,' or we shall possibly be led into dangerous error: for it is a dangerous error to affiliate our particular creed directly upon Scripture, so as to make the latter responsible, not only for every sentiment therein expressed but, even for the form of words in which it is expressed. If, by the aphorism, above mentioned, be meant, that the Bible is with Protestants the ultimate authority in matters of faith, its truth is undeniable; for whatever we hold as Protestants, we hold because we believe it can be proved by Holy Scripture: but if the meaning intended to be conveyed be, that Scripture is Protestantism, and Protestantism Scripture, the assertion is not true, and what is more, is an unwarrantable assumption. Protestantism, as a system of doctrine, may have many defects which need, like the errors of Romanism, to be corrected by a reference to Scripture. The Inspired Word itself must be jealously guarded from such an identification with theological systems, which have been built up by the operation of the logical faculty, as would place both on the same footing of authority."—pp. 17—19.

Equally impossible is it to appeal to the ancient creeds of the universal Church in this case. We cite Mr. Litton's remarks on this subject, partly to show that he is not one of those who undervalue the creeds:—

"Equally obvious is it, indeed it need hardly be observed, that the three œcumenical creeds contribute nothing towards enabling us to ascertain the distinctive doctrines of the Romish, and the Reformed, Churches. They, like Scripture, are the common property of both parties,—the expression of their common Christianity,—the ground upon which they must both unite against the common enemy—rationalism, or infidelity. An agreement of both parties in the great objective truths of Christianity, as expressed in the creeds, must be pre-supposed, if we are to understand clearly the point of divergence:—otherwise, we shall be wasting our time in contending about first principles. Protestants may not arrive at their belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures,

or of the doctrines expressed in the Creed, by the same road which Romanists take; but if they do accept the Scriptures as the Word of God, and the doctrine of the Trinity as part of that Word, it is enough: it is comparatively of little consequence *how* they came by their faith: Romish controversialists are constantly forgetting this, and asking us, how we prove the inspiration of Scripture, &c.? They might as well go back further, and ask us how we prove the existence of a God. There is a certain portion of ground common to both parties, to dispute about which is wholly irrelevant to the questions on which they are really divided. Moreover, for either party to adopt the three Creeds as its symbol, is to ignore the existence of its opponent. If we choose to forget that the Reformed and the Romish Churches are existing realities, and imagine ourselves to be living in the fourth century, we may adopt this course; otherwise, it is an illusion, and a dangerous one: The supposition upon which it is really based is, that there are no essential differences between Romanism and Protestantism, or, in other words, that we may reunite ourselves to the Church of Rome, without forfeiting our position as a Protestant Church. Nothing can be more suicidal than the attempts which have been made in certain quarters to substitute, as the symbol of the English Church, the three Creeds for the Thirty-nine Articles; as if the former comprise every thing which distinguishes us as a Church. So far forth as we are a Christian Church, as distinguished from Socinians, Jews, and Mahometans, the ancient creeds are our symbols; but they are not so, so far forth as we are a Reformed Church, for they contain no protest against the peculiar errors of Rome."—pp. 19, 20.

Mr. Litton also sets aside the private writings of the Reformers and of their opponents, as furnishing no adequate evidence of the faith of either party, and he limits the sources of information to the Tridentine definitions on the one hand; and (subordinately) the Catechism of the Council and the Creed of Pope Pius; and on the other, to the Protestant confessions. We own that we think a concession has been here made to Rome, which is scarcely expedient or justifiable; for, assuredly, the Church of Rome, which claims authority to decide all controversies, and which assumes perfect infallibility, so as to render it impossible for her to tolerate any error in her communion, is responsible for her practical, approved, universal teaching, even if there be no statement of the kind in the Tridentine synod. Is not the Church of Rome responsible for the extravagant and idolatrous worship paid to the Virgin Mary? Yet, that species of worship is not prescribed by the Council of Trent; and the regular game of Romanists is to pretend that they are not responsible for any amount or degree of authorized idolatry and superstition, because it is not *totidem verbis* to be found in the decrees of Trent.

In point of fact, when Mr. Litton proceeds to investigate the

doctrine of the Church of Rome as the Church, he is obliged to refer at once to the Catechism of the Council, which, as he observes, is not, strictly speaking, of a symbolical character. He quotes at some length from this Catechism, marking especially those passages in which it is stated, that "in the Church militant two kinds of men are comprised, the good and the evil," "both of whom are believers, as professing the same faith, and partaking of the same sacraments;" that, "since it rightfully claims the obedience of all men, it must, of necessity, be a conspicuous object, and easily known;" that, with the exception of unbelievers, separatists, and excommunicated, "all, however wicked they may be, must be held to be in the Church;" and other similar passages, from which it appears that the view of the Church of Rome is simply that the universal Church is a visible body, including equally the wicked and the good, and consequently, *in its essence*, a visible and outward organization with a visible head, government, unity, and authority.

The various Protestant confessions are then quoted, and the doctrine conveyed in them is thus expounded:—

"The one true Church, the holy Catholic Church of the Creed, is not a body of mixed composition, comprehending within its pale both the evil and the good; it is the community of those who, wherever they may be, are in living union with Christ by faith, and partake of the sanctifying influences of His Spirit. Properly, it comprises, besides its members now upon earth, all who shall ultimately be saved. In its more confined acceptation, the phrase denotes the body of true believers existing at any given time in the world.

"The true Church is so far invisible as that it is not yet manifested in its corporate capacity; or, in other words, there is no one society, or visible corporation upon earth, of which it can be said that it is the mystical body of Christ. Hence, of course, the Head of this body is not visible.

"Particular Churches, otherwise unconnected societies, are one by reason of their common relation to, and connexion with, the one true Church or mystical body of Christ. The outward notes of this connexion, and therefore of a true visible Church, are the pure preaching of the Word (in fundamentals at least), and the administration of the sacraments 'according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.' These are the two indispensable notes of a true Church: to them may be added, though it stands not in the same order of necessity, the exercise of discipline.

"Although visible Churches are, according to the idea, 'congregations of saints,' i. e. of really sanctified persons, and must be regarded as such if they are to have the name of Churches, yet they are never really so; in point of fact, they are always mixed communities, comprising hypocrites and nominal Christians, as well as true believers,

a perfect separation between whom is, in the present life, impossible, and is reserved to the second coming of Christ to judgment. Hence the aggregate of visible Christian Churches throughout the world is not exactly identical with the true Church, which, as has been said, consists only of the living members of Christ.

"Such notes as, 'the succession of bishops,' 'antiquity,' 'amplitude,' 'the *name* of Catholic,' &c., are, *taken alone*, not sufficient to prove a society to be a true Church of Christ.

"To the one true Church, the body of Christ, properly belong the promises of perpetuity, of the continued presence of Christ, and of preservation from fundamental error. The same may be said of the attributes of the Church, unity, sanctity, &c.; these, in their full and proper sense, can be predicated only of that body of Christ which is not yet fully manifested."—pp. 51, 52.

We apprehend that the above representation is not strictly correct; and that it is not possible to harmonize precisely the views of some of these confessions in regard to the universal Church and particular Churches with those of other confessions. Mr. Litton draws a very strong line of distinction between the universal and particular Churches, regarding the former as a pure and unmixed body of saints, and the latter as mixed bodies, including evil as well as good. Now this broadly-marked difference is not, we think, discernible in all the confessions he refers to. For instance, (p. 34,) he remarks, that in the seventh article of the Confession of Augsburg, the Church is thus described:—"We teach that one holy Church shall ever be in the world; but the Church is a congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is purely preached, and the sacraments rightly administered." And again, in our own nineteenth Article, which is based on the above, it is stated that "the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all these things that of necessity are requisite to the same. As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred," &c. Mr. Litton observes, that both these Articles labour under the same ambiguity or "confusion" of senses in which the word Church is used; that there is a transition from the "one holy Church" to particular Churches; for that this "one holy Church" cannot be described as "a congregation of saints," or of "faithful men," "where the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered;" that this evidently refers only to local Churches or visible Churches, composed of such congregations; that the Article of the Church of England ought to be translated differently "a visible Church,"

instead of "*the* visible Church," which would remove the difficulty. In fine, he states that the Lutheran formularies generally "labour under a want of clearness and precision of statement" on this subject; but that the Reformed are more full and discriminating in their statements. And yet even in these, as it appears to us, there is a good deal of the same kind of view which Mr. Litton regards as an ambiguity or confusion. For instance, in the very first Reformed Confession he refers to, the Helvetic, of 1566, says,—

"There can be but one Church; which, moreover, we call 'Catholic,' because it is diffused throughout the world. The Church, indeed, may be viewed under the twofold aspect of triumphant and militant; but these terms may denote different conditions of the members of the same Church. *The Church militant upon earth has always existed under the form of many particular Churches, which, however, are all connected with each other by their common relation to the Catholic Church.*"

We have preserved Mr. Litton's own italics in this passage, and we must say that, to our minds, it represents the essence of the universal Church, and of particular Churches, as identical. The Scottish Confession does not throw any light on the subject. The Belgic Confession speaks of "the Catholic Church" as "the community of all true believers;" and we distinctly affirm that it represents this Catholic Church as visible, and that external communion with it is indispensable. The Tetrapolitan Confession does not regard the Church as a pure community of saints; for it holds that "false professors will ever be found" in it: so that, on the whole, we must say, that even the quotations adduced by Mr. Litton fail in establishing the belief of the Reformers in any such essential distinction between the Church universal and particular Churches as he ascribes to them.

On the contrary, we should say that the unanimous opinions of the Lutheran and the Reformed Confessions is this: that there is one universal Church of Christ, consisting of those who believe in Him, and are justified by faith; that this Church is, indeed, *invisible* in its essence, *i. e.* as regards the living faith of its vital members, and their union with God; but is also visible, including evil men as well as good; and that it exists in all the particular Churches throughout the world, which have a right faith and a true administration of the sacraments. The universal Church is the whole, of which they are parts, and merely differs from them in extent, not in essence; that is to say, there is no such distinction drawn as that the universal Church consists only of the justified, whereas particular Churches include unjustified persons

also. We do not hesitate to say that such a view is *not* that of the Protestant Confessions; and we think that the view of the latter, which we have attempted to state, is simpler and less confused than that advocated by Mr. Litton, and, we will add, *more scriptural*; for assuredly in Scripture particular Churches, as much as the one universal Church, are supposed to consist of "saints."

We would refer to such passages as these:—"To all that be in Rome, *beloved of God*, called saints." "Unto the Church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called saints." "To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." "To the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." "To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse," &c. In these and many other similar passages, particular Churches, visible Churches, are described as Churches of saints, of justified persons, just exactly as the universal Church is. Therefore we think that the Reformers were not speaking in any confused way, when they passed from the universal to particular Churches, supposing both to be holy, both to be mixed with sinners, and both to be visible.

Now the fact is, that the Church universal and particular Churches are continually spoken of in Scripture, and in the Protestant confessions as holy, elect, sanctified, and consisting of the justified and true members of Christ. And Mr. Litton has in various parts of his work explained very clearly how this is. The Church is spoken of as it is in *idea and essence*: *i. e.* it is spoken of as a *reality*, setting aside the notion of all that is temporary, alien, hypocritical, unreal. Unbelievers, apostates, hypocrites, are not taken into account at all when the Church is spoken of in its real, essential relations to God. The union of such persons with the Church is merely formal, outward, apparent: they are in reality no part of the Church of the living God. Baptism may have been conferred on an unbeliever, but he is not truly made a member of Christ, or of the Church which is his body. None truly belong to the Church as the spiritual body of which Christ is the Head, if they are not joined by living faith to Christ the Head. So that the universal Church, and every part and portion of it, is described as a society of saints or justified persons. Now it is in this point of view that the Church is often spoken of in Scripture; and to the Church in this highest point of view most of the promises are made: "The gates of hell will not prevail against it." It is "the pillar and ground of truth." Christ is with it "always, even to the end of the world." It is "holy and without blemish," It is the "Bride" of the Lamb.

It is one in faith and charity, holy in its relation to God, Catholic in its diffusiveness, apostolical in its origin. The same vital principle of faith exists in all its members, even amidst apparent or real differences of opinion, or involuntary error.

But there is another point of view in which the universal Church may be considered, namely, as visible or discoverable in all parts as an organized company of believers, uniting in worship, professing certain forms of faith, creeds, discipline, and so forth. Now the Church, considered in this point of view, includes many who are not really members of Christ, but carnal livers and enemies of Christ. The majority of its members may be so at any time. The majority of its ministers may be so at any time. And therefore evil may have the predominance, and error may prevail at any time in the Church in its visible aspect, in the universal Church, as well as in particular Churches. The error of Romanists consists in ascribing to the mixed visible Church all these promises and attributes which belong strictly and really to the communion of saints only.

This distinction is brought before us in Mr. Litton's work, and we think it is well worthy of attention, and will serve to clear up various questions which are subjects of some perplexity to certain minds.

Mr. Litton refutes, very satisfactorily, the allegations of Moehler, that Protestantism recognizes no visible association as any essential feature in Christianity. The following remarks on the institution of the Christian ministry, and the Christian society, as features in the Divine economy, are deserving of especial attention :—

“ The fact is, the Church may, and indeed must always be, viewed under a twofold aspect; it is both the manifestation, and the instrument of Christ's saving power; it is both the visible evidence of the Saviour's unseen existence and operation, and the means whereby, from age to age, He gathers in His elect. The supposition that the divine plan would be to save individuals by an immediate, and exclusively internal, operation of the Spirit, is negatived by the whole analogy of nature. The rule observed by the Creator in His providential government of the world is, not to interfere directly in human affairs, but to effect His purposes mediately, and by means of instruments. It is thus that having at first, by an exercise of His Almighty will, launched the heavenly bodies into space, and assigned to each a determinate path of revolution, He has, instead of perpetually renewing that original impulse, subjected them to the uniform operation of a law, by which, as a secondary cause, their motions are now governed, and they retained in their appointed orbits. So also, having created men, in the first instance, by an immediate act of Omnipotence, out of the dust of the earth, He has replenished the world with human beings, not by a

repetition of that primary miracle, but by causing all men to spring, by propagation, from the original pair. In the same way, the well-being, both spiritual and temporal, of each individual is very much dependent upon the voluntary acts of others; and though nothing is more certain than that God wills the happiness of all His creatures, He often suffers (as it appears to us) His gracious purposes to be frustrated, rather than infringe the rule which He has prescribed to Himself, of making man the instrument of good to man. It would be a deviation, then, from the rule which He observes in other things, were God either to dispense with human instruments in bringing men to the knowledge of Christ, or to make no provision for perpetuating that saving knowledge by a law of succession, analogous to that which we see in operation in the material world. In a word, we should consider it quite in accordance with the analogy of nature, that while, in the well-known words of Bishop Butler, 'miraculous powers' should be 'given to the first preachers of Christianity, in order to their introducing it into the world, a visible Church' (or visible Churches) 'should be established in order to continue it and carry it on throughout all ages: to be the repository of the oracles of God; to hold up the light of revelation in aid to that of nature, and propagate it throughout all generations to the end of the world.'

"And so, in point of fact, was it ordered. The Church, being in the first instance formally constituted by the miraculous descent of the Spirit, was thenceforward both to perpetuate itself, and to evangelize the world, by the agency of human instruments. It is in the use of the Word and the Sacraments, preached and administered by men, that the existing members of the Church are built up in the faith: it is by pastoral instruction that the children and catechumens of the society are prepared both for full communion with the Church and for the office of transmitting, in their turn, the faith which they received from their fathers to generations yet unborn. So it is also in the work of missions. The Church, in fulfilling her Lord's command to evangelize all nations, must employ human agency. 'How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent?' And upon the Church is imposed the duty of sending. If the duty be neglected, no miraculous interference can be expected to atone for the neglect; and the heathen perish. It is evident, then, and admitted, that it is of the essence of the Church, not only to be visible, that is, to manifest its existence by outward signs, but to be the human instrument both of edifying its own members, and of converting the heathen; and we can form no idea of it which does not represent it as preaching, teaching, and administering the Sacraments. Under this aspect it comes into view in the earliest notices which we have of it. No sooner had the Spirit been given, than the Apostles, in obedience to their Lord's command, began to be 'witnesses of him' 'in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.' The infant community of Christians at once exhibited the aspect of an actively

aggressive body, assailing every form of superstition and error, and inviting all men to partake of the blessings of salvation ; while within the society itself, by means of the ' Apostles' doctrine,' participation in the Holy Communion, and the exercise of discipline, Christians were built up in Christ."—pp. 64—66.

While, however, the view here taken represents the social character of Christianity, and the existence of the ministry, as divinely-appointed features in the Church, it yet regards them as of secondary importance in comparison with the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christians, which constitutes the spiritual and unseen essence of the Church. It looks to the Church in its invisible capacity, and in that which certainly alone constitutes it in reality, while the opposite view regards the Church exclusively in its outward characteristics, its organization, government, treating it simply as a visible society made up of evil and good men, and as the means for making men religious, and putting them in the way of salvation. In this view it is a matter of indifference to the *idea* of the Church, whether its members be or be not actually sanctified by the Spirit of God. Such are Mr. Litton's statements on the point, which undoubtedly are to a certain extent true, and which apply in some degree to other theories besides the Romish.

Having stated these opposite views, this writer proceeds to inquire into their truth respectively.

"The Romanist," he says, "defines the Church by its outward, the Protestant by its inward characteristics : the former makes its essence to consist in its visible rites and polity ; the latter holds that its true being lies in its spiritual, and therefore unseen, union with Christ. Which of these views is the true one ?"—p. 81.

The mode of inquiry pursued is historical. The general character of the elder dispensation is viewed as preparatory to, and distinguished from, the Christian dispensation, and the spiritual character of the latter is elicited. The nature of the Jewish law and theocracy is largely dwelt on, for this reason, that the Romish conception of the Church is altogether based on the idea of its being a continuation of the Jewish system ; a new law, presenting, in an improved and spiritualized form, the essential features of the old law.

"The Gospel," we are told, "is a new law, presenting not merely the substance of which Judaism presented the shadow, but an exact counterpart of the features of the ancient system ; so that instead of the temple at Jerusalem, to which the Jews, wherever they might be, looked as the central seat of their religion, we have now the apostolical chair at Rome, the centre of unity to all Christians ; instead of priests

by natural, we have priests by spiritual, descent; an unbloody sacrifice takes the place of 'the blood of calves and goats;' a graduated hierarchy succeeds to the threefold order of the ancient ministers of the altar; and we have a liturgical ceremonial, which, it is avowed, finds its parallel in the worship and ceremonies of the old law, ordained by God Himself."—p. 123.

There is much valuable matter in proof that the law, the prophets, and the preparatory teaching of John the Baptist, lead on gradually from a system of formal and outward observances, and from the notion of a Church, or people of God, chiefly under an outward and visible system, to the notion of a higher and more inward teaching as the essence of religion, operating outwardly however. The author then proceeds to investigate the character of the Christian dispensation, and shows that while it was a visible system from the beginning, yet the Church as established by our Lord and the Apostles was a system which worked *from within* outwardly, whose outward ordinances presupposed the existence of the inner spirit, and were not a complete new apparatus, but an adaptation of existing forms, and were gradually and progressively produced as necessity dictated.

We will not dwell on the details of the argument as applied to the sacraments and polity of the Church. The Divine institution of the sacraments is shown to have been connected with no formal liturgical ceremonial, and no special sacerdotal caste, as in the laws of Moses. It is urged that spiritual life is not caused but strengthened by the sacraments; and that the organization of the Christian ministry was only gradual. And the inference is drawn that Christianity is not "*primarily*" a visible institution, and that as it is the manhood of revealed religion, the Christian has emerged from the bondage of the Law into the glorious liberty of the children of God; that the Christian system contains no arbitrary or unreasonable appointments; that the sacraments are reasonable—we understand their import and object; and that their validity depends not on a prescribed ritual, but on the faith of the recipient; that the organization of the Church by the Apostles was in accordance with the general directions of our Lord, but was not in all points declared to be binding for ever.

We must confess that, admitting to a great extent the force and truth of all this reasoning, we are somewhat at a loss to see its argumentative conclusiveness in the questions at issue between us and the Church of Rome. Mr. Litton shows, very rightly, that the Church is, in its essence, invisible; *i. e.* that its real and vital members are, as such, not discernible. And he shows that spiritual union with Christ is the great essential of

the Church; and that sacraments, and politics, and outward and visible signs of the Christian life are subordinate and secondary. And yet he does not deny that all these things are, subordinately to the essential idea of the Church, the institutions of Christ. He holds that the Church universal is in one sense visible as well as invisible, and that particular Churches are in one sense invisible and in another visible; and he admits that there *are* outward forms and ordinances which were actually instituted by Christ. Now it appears to us, that the Roman Catholic, or the High Churchman, may rejoin to Mr. Litton that they do not recognize his representation of their systems as ignoring that view of the Church universal which he upholds; but that they merely speak ordinarily of the Church in its visible aspect, the existence of which he himself admits.

His great argument against the Papal supremacy appears to be this. The universal Church consists only of a congregation of saints or justified persons; but this body is essentially invisible; therefore it needs no visible head. "Well but," it may be said, "you yourself allow that the Church is, that is, its members are, in some sense visible. You allow continually that it is so—that it is social in its character—that it has its sacraments and ministry in accordance with the will of Christ. You admit the Church to be visible, though in a secondary and subordinate point of view. How therefore can you argue that there cannot be a visible *head* too, if that head and the visibility of the Church be kept in subordination to the Divine Head, and the invisible Church?" We may be very obtuse, but it really does not seem to us that Mr. Litton's argument is as conclusive as we should wish it to be on this point. We merely state the questions which present themselves to us in perusing his very able work.

Having stated the general idea of the Church, the work before us proceeds in the second and third books to examine the notes and attributes of the Church. It explains that there can be, properly speaking, no "notes," meaning by the term something that meets the eye, some property or character which renders the subject in which it inheres capable of recognition; because the Church is essentially invisible, and its visible manifestation is an imperfect one; and though in a certain sense unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity may be predicated most truly of the invisible Church, they cannot, except very imperfectly, be applied to the visible Church. And therefore he refers us to notes of a different kind, which "are independent of the actual condition of the Christian body," namely, the pure preaching of the Word, and the right administration of the sacraments. May we be excused for here expressing our opinion that "the *pure* preaching

of the Word," and "the *right* administration of the sacraments," depend most essentially on the *actual* condition of the Christian body? Can it be said, even of these notes or characteristics, that they are otherwise than imperfectly manifested by human agencies? And are they not, in a certain degree, cognizable without vital faith, or by the aid of the same natural faculties which might be appealed to by the apparently more tangible notes of unity, sanctity, catholicity, &c. In fact, may not the alleged correspondence of certain tenets with the Bible, be as much the subject of merely intellectual inquiry, as the alleged extent, antiquity, sanctity, succession, and miracles of a particular communion? One objection of the Roman Catholic divines to such notes as the truth of doctrine, in determining where the true Church is to be found, is, that it would lead to endless investigation. But we should here join issue with them; for the truth is, that the discussion of the notes of the Church, as propounded by them, is one which may extend to almost any length; and we conceive that a much shorter way of terminating controversy would be found by selecting one or two leading doctrines, and determining on which side the truth is to be found. Mr. Litton has examined the objections of Romanist divines to these Protestant notes, and has very ably answered them.

The argument by which Mr. Litton endeavours to show that the theories of unity maintained by some, whether that unity be supposed to consist in communion with the episcopate, or the see of Rome, are unfounded, is conducted with much ability; but we cannot agree with him in all points. We select, however, the following interesting passage relative to the origin and authority of episcopacy, which, from a writer of his views, who denies any form of Church polity to be essential, is of especial value.

"With these limitations, the testimony of the early Church to the apostolicity of a then existing practice may be admitted as readily as any other human testimony to a matter of fact. In the particular case with which we are now concerned, this testimony is as cogent as can well be conceived. It is not merely that the Fathers unanimously ascribe the institution of episcopacy to the Apostles; the moment we pass out of Scripture into the field of uninspired history we are met by the fact of the universal prevalence of that form of Church government, a fact which can only be satisfactorily accounted for by the supposition of its having proceeded from the Apostles. The evidence, it has been seen, will not permit us to assign to episcopacy proper an earlier date than A.D. 70, or some period subsequent to St. Paul's martyrdom; and yet it is evident from the epistles of Ignatius (A.D. 107, or, according to others, A.D. 116), that in his time the episcopal polity had

become firmly and universally established : how improbable it is that, unsupported by apostolic institution, it would have prevailed so speedily and universally needs not to be pointed out. But this is not all. In the early ecclesiastical historians the succession of bishops in most of the considerable Churches is traced up to the very times of the Apostles ; traditions the authenticity of which there is no reason, except in those particular points in which they seem to clash with the facts of Scripture, to call in question. Thus we are told that St. Paul appointed Timothy bishop of Ephesus, and Titus bishop of Crete : it is not, indeed, for the reasons previously given, likely that the Apostle himself conferred the episcopal office upon them ; but nothing is more probable than that, when episcopacy was introduced, Timothy and Titus were fixed as formal bishops in the Churches in which they had already exercised quasi-episcopal functions. The same is very likely to have been the case with Linus and others, whose names occur in the New Testament, and whom history records to have been the first bishops of their respective sees. From among the immediate companions of the Apostles the first bishops would naturally be chosen.

“ The reasons why we retain episcopacy may be briefly summed up as follows : when we open the ecclesiastical remains,—say of the fourth century,—we find no other form of polity any where existing, whether in the Catholic Church, or in the bodies dissident therefrom. The same fact meets us in every preceding century, up to a period when one at least of the Apostles,—St. John,—must have been surviving. We find the Christian writers of each age unanimous in assigning to that form of Church polity an apostolical origin. At length we come to Scripture itself. Here, indeed, it seems difficult to discover a formal episcopate ; nevertheless we find presbyters and deacons, and the Apostles over both : we find St. Paul delegating to individuals a portion of his apostolical authority, the functions which they were to exercise closely resembling those which formal bishops afterwards exercised. If the Apocalyptic angels are to be considered as individuals in ecclesiastical office, we may fairly infer, from the mention of them, that, at that time, each Church was presided over by one chief pastor. So far, then, from there being any thing in the episcopal regimen which, from its disagreement with scriptural precedent, might lead us to hesitate in giving credence to the witness of tradition affirming it to be of apostolical institution, there are positive data in Scripture which, if not conclusive on that point, are yet sufficient to warrant us in saying that it is agreeable to the mind of the Apostles. Thus, no antecedent objection standing in the way, full scope is left to the force of the uninspired testimony which, under such circumstances, becomes irresistible. No reasonable doubt can be entertained that episcopacy proper took its rise at some period between A.D. 70 and A.D. 100 ; and as little that it was either established or sanctioned by the Apostles then living, especially the survivor of the whole body,—St. John,—whose residence in Asia Minor, where tradition fixes the beginnings of the episcopate, points him out as in all probability that one of the

twelve to whom the Church owes this extension of her polity, the only one, beyond presbyters and deacons, which can make any pretence to an apostolical religion."—pp. 433—436.

It gives us much pleasure to be enabled to concur generally with the author's views in regard to the ground which should be taken by the defenders of episcopacy. To place the argument exclusively on scriptural ground appears to us unwise, because it omits that branch of the argument which is essential to the force and weight of the scriptural argument itself. And we would commend to especial notice the testimony which this author bears to the advantage possessed by those who are enabled to trace the connexion of their principles with the Primitive Church, and the inexpediency of throwing aside all reference to Christian antiquity, as is sometimes unwisely done.

"As long as the advocates for episcopacy are content to rest their cause upon post-apostolic testimony, their position is impregnable: it is only when they attempt to prove it from scripture alone that the argument fails to convince. Better at once to acknowledge that the institution is traceable to the Apostles chiefly through the channel of uninspired history, than, by insisting upon insufficient scriptural evidence, to bring discredit upon the whole argument, as an injudicious advocate, by undertaking to prove too much, often damages a really strong cause. True it is that, in making such an acknowledgment, episcopalians abandon the high ground of a divine law, perpetually binding; but they only abandon what is untenable, while the argument for the retention of the episcopal polity remains unaffected. For it does not follow that because we cannot pronounce this polity to be essential to the Church, and are even compelled to prove its apostolicity by extra-scriptural evidence, we are therefore at liberty to reject it. Every institution which we have reason to regard as an apostolical one, by whatever road we may have arrived at that conclusion, comes to us with a *primâ facie* claim upon our acceptance, and may not be lightly rejected. 'It is clear that the whole argument should be confined to the Scriptures;' so writes a recent opponent of episcopacy, availing himself of the concession of his antagonist, Bishop Onderdonk, that 'the claim of episcopacy to be of divine origin, and therefore obligatory upon the Church, rests fundamentally on the one question, Has it the authority of Scripture? If it has not, it is not necessarily binding.' We shall hereafter examine whether, even if it had the express authority of Scripture, the inference could be at once drawn that it is immutably binding upon the Church; meanwhile it may be observed that no episcopalian who understands the strength of his own position will concede that, when the question is not concerning the perpetual obligation of episcopacy as a divinely-prescribed polity, but concerning its apostolicity, the argument is to be confined to Scripture alone. Nothing can be more irrational than entirely to disconnect ourselves from the

early Church, as if in each successive age Christianity had to be begun *de novo*; or as if there were no other evidence of apostolic practices but that which is derivable from Scripture, and no medium between affirming an institution to be necessarily binding, and rejecting it. The indispensable part which the testimony of the early Church bears in authenticating Scripture itself, proves that it never was the Divine intention that, annihilating the intervening centuries between ourselves and the Apostles, we should confine our attention solely to Scripture, and reject as worthless whatever cannot be found there recorded: only let us bear in mind that the moment we pass beyond the inspired Word, we pass from the region of what is divine and essential to the lower ground of what is, or is not, as the case may be, probably apostolical. By descending from the higher, and, as it should seem, untenable ground of a divine prescription to this lower one, the episcopalian gains immensely in the real strength of his argument; and as long as he is content with maintaining that episcopacy is an apostolical institution, and therefore to be retained by Churches which would follow the apostolical model, it will be impossible to dislodge him from his position.

“Nor is it a fair statement which the same writer makes that ‘it is a point of essential importance in this controversy, that the burden of proof lies on the friends of episcopacy;’ unless, indeed, by the ‘friends of episcopacy’ be meant those who put forth claims respecting it which virtually consigns all non-episcopal Churches to the uncovenanted mercies of God. Here, again, moderation is strength. If we are content to take the lower ground, and to maintain that episcopacy is to be retained because, though not expressly recorded in Scripture, the apostolicity of its origin may be otherwise established, the burden of proof is unquestionably thrown upon the opponent. We retain episcopacy because it has been handed down to us, without a break, from the times of the Apostles: the presumption that we are right in doing so is entirely with us: we are in possession of the field: and he who would introduce another form of polity must be prepared to prove that episcopacy is intrinsically, and without reference to the abuses to which, in common with all forms of Church government, it is liable, unscriptural.”—pp. 436—439.

Undoubtedly, the episcopal polity holds the ground of prior possession, and its opponents are bound to prove it unlawful. This was, in fact, what the Puritans in England, and the Presbyterians in Scotland, attempted. They objected to episcopacy on the ground that a parity of ministers, and the establishment of lay elders, was of divine right. And we really do not see on what ground any person who maintains the lawfulness of episcopacy can justify the origin either of puritanism or of presbyterianism. The Continental Reformers took, to a great degree, the ground of necessity, or of certain inherent rights, supposed to exist in extreme cases in the Christian community or its presbyters; but they never dreamt of opposing episcopacy as unlawful. Sweden,

and England, and Denmark, and Germany, all bore witness, more or less, to the lawfulness of episcopacy, and of an imparity of ministers; and since episcopacy was therefore, by the confession of the Reformation, lawful, and since it was universal even from the age of the Apostles, and was instituted by the Apostles, and is indicated in Scripture itself, we think that it is clearly a duty to maintain this polity, and to recover it, if possible, if it should have been lost in any country. Yet we must so far agree with Mr. Litton, that we see no such declarations or grounds in God's word as would entitle us to affirm that the Church of Christ does not exist at all where this polity is not actually in existence. The history of the development of the papacy leads on to the following description of the Reformation, and its mode of proceeding. Mr. Litton is an independent thinker, and does not conceal facts, even if they are opposed to certain popular theories. The following testimony to the moderation with which the Reformation treated the papacy, the gradual discovery of the unfounded nature of the papal claims, and the statement that the Reformation was *not a voluntary separation* from the Romish Church, are deserving of observation.

“ It is worthy of observation, however, that, throughout that great movement, it was not so much the fact, as the doctrine, of the Roman primacy against which the Reformers took up their position; they even declared that if the Bishop of Rome would acknowledge that his superiority to the other bishops was but by the custom of the Church, they, on their part, would leave him in undisturbed possession of his patriarchal relation to the Churches of Western Christendom. The remarkable passage of Melancthon to that effect is well known:— ‘ Concerning the Roman Pontiff, my opinion is, that, should he admit the Gospel, the precedence which he has hitherto enjoyed, as compared with other bishops, may, to preserve the peace and tranquillity of those Christians who acknowledge his jurisdiction, be by us also accorded to him; but only *jure humano*.’ But, the pope refusing either to allow free scope to the Gospel, or to relax in his personal pretensions, the Reformers exhorted the sovereigns of their respective countries to resume the powers which rightfully belonged to them, and, with the consent of their people and nobles, to introduce the reforms which were universally desired, whether the Bishop of Rome should agree thereto or not. For this they were threatened with excommunication, the effect of which would be to shut them out from the hope of salvation. But they took leave to inquire into the ground of the dogma, that communion with the Bishop of Rome is a necessary condition of salvation: they found it not in the early fathers, nor in Scripture: appealing from the so-called successors of the Apostles to the Apostles themselves, they demanded, but in vain, that the divine ordinance, appointing the Bishop of Rome vicar of Christ upon earth, should be produced: and at length,

feeling their ground firm, they pronounced the whole doctrine to be, as indeed it was, an impudent fabrication. They did not separate from the Romish Church, but they asserted the right of every national Church to regulate, independently of the Bishop of Rome, its own affairs : on her part, Rome pronounced every Church which exercised this right to be cut off from Christ. This is now our relative position : we maintaining that we have only resumed rights which were always ours, though for a time they may have been permitted to lie in abeyance, Rome affirming that we have violated a divine ordinance.”—pp. 484, 485.

The writer then proceeds to consider the sanctity of the Church, in the course of which the errors of the Montanists, Novatians, and Donatists, and their excessive severity, are commented upon. We observe that no notice is taken of the views of Dissenters on this point ; and yet their view certainly is, that each visible Church is to consist only of saints ; that it is to be identical with the mystical body of Christ ; and the author acknowledges this, in the case of the Donatists, to have been “a vain attempt,” which “recoiled on its authors.” (p. 518). We observe that Mr. Litton (p. 304) censures a writer who had remarked on these principles of dissent ; but we apprehend that Mr. Litton himself would not, on consideration, be prepared to approve of pure dissenting views of the Church, which are strained and excessive.

In the latter part of his volume, Mr. Litton enters at length on the subject of the Christian ministry, and conceding fully the principle of successive ordinations and self-perpetuation, he speculates with much freedom on many important questions. In reference to episcopal ordinations, and ordinations generally, for instance, he questions the necessity of the assistance of any bishop, and grounds his view on the silence of Scripture, and the want of testimony in the early Church. He is disposed to believe that the Bishop of Alexandria received no ordination as bishop, but was merely elected and installed ; and he—although Mr. Palmer has, according to him, explained some alleged corroborative testimony to the fact, so as to deprive it of any decisive authority—yet holds that this testimony, which in one instance is alleged to relate to a wholly different subject, and in another to be of no historical value, affords, when united, “a strong presumption.” Mr. Litton confirms this strong presumption by a passage from an old writer, who remarks that “in Alexandria et per totam Ægyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat presbyter.” (p. 570). This writer is said by Mr. Litton to have lived not later than the fourth century ; but assuredly, considering the case of Colluthus, who was in that very century pronounced by an Egyptian synod to be unordained because he had been ordained merely by a presbyter, it is rather

strange that ordination by a priest should be supposed to have been allowed. The truth is, we apprehend, that the passage referred to by Mr. Litton does not speak of ordination, but of the Eucharist. It was, we know, unusual in many Churches for presbyters to consecrate this sacrament, which was reserved to the bishop. We have not the work at hand to refer to the context, but we apprehend that this must be the meaning. We do not mean to say, however, that the well-known passage of Jerome to which Mr. Litton refers, is without its difficulties. Its apparent meaning is in favour of his view; but still we should not readily admit the existence of so singular an exception to the general rule as this would be. The case would be different if there were any parallel instances, or corroborative circumstance; but we do not see any such.

We regret to observe that a writer, who has many claims on our respect, should, in several parts of his work, give expression to views on the subject of the scriptural authority for infant baptism, which appear to be unnecessary and mistaken. We see little benefit in the care he has taken to subvert the argument for infant baptism derived from its analogy with circumcision. It is true, indeed, and we deeply lament to see it, that it has of late become not unusual amongst those who oppose the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, to throw doubt on the scriptural authority for infant baptism. To us, we confess, this difficulty does not present itself. We should argue thus: The children of Christians are included in the covenant, and reckoned amongst the people of God, because St. Peter says, "The promise is to you and to your children;" and St. Paul says, "Else are your children unclean, but now are they holy." Since, then, they are included in the covenant, and are a part of the people of God, they may lawfully be admitted to the sign of the covenant, i.e. baptism, on the principle of St. Peter, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" And the lawfulness of this course is confirmed by the institution of God Himself under the old covenant, when those who were included in the covenant with God, were also admitted to the sign and seal of that covenant on the eighth day. Now we think that, with such scriptural principles to support us, it may be fairly and reasonably maintained that infant baptism may be established from Scripture.

Mr. Litton has argued at great length, in his Appendix, against the generally received idea, that baptism corresponds in the Christian economy to circumcision under the Jewish. He points out certain differences between these rites, and remarks that it is a mistake to imagine that circumcision introduced the

children of Israelites into covenant with God, for that they were so by *birth* ; and that circumcision was merely the sign and seal of the covenant, without which they would be cut off from God's people. This is very true ; but we would reply that the children of Christians are, like those of Jews, included in the covenant, and yet they are bound at *some time*, as every one admits, to receive baptism as an outward sign of that covenant and as a means of grace ; so that there is no inconsiderable resemblance between the respective positions of the two rites, though the Christian sacrament, as a means of grace, is a higher and holier thing than circumcision. We are glad to see the truth so fairly stated on this latter point in the following passage, though we think the writer is mistaken in denying the analogy between baptism and circumcision :—

“ It will be seen that the parallel holds good only in the accidental, and fails in the essential properties of the ordinances. Baptism is a means of grace ; circumcision was not : baptism is the rite of admission to the privileges connected with incorporation in Christ ; circumcision was not to the Jewish infant an analogous ordinance. For baptism does confessedly hold in the Christian economy that place which some would assign to circumcision in the ancient. Whatever part we assign to the Word in the work of regeneration, no one would maintain that a believer is, by virtue of his faith merely, in Christ : confessedly the Christian life, in the proper sense of the words, and the full enjoyment of Christian privileges, such as justification and adoption, dates from the administration of the sacrament of the new birth, to which is assigned the office of formally grafting us into Christ. Hence, as is observed at p. 290, the real correspondence lies not between circumcision and baptism, but between the birth of the Jew and regeneration (of which baptism is the sign and partly the instrument), as indeed the metaphor sufficiently indicates.”—p. 704.

We regret to observe, indeed, that the tendency of this work is in several places to overthrow the argument for infant baptism. We entirely believe that the author had no such intention, and we admit that he states fully his belief that the practice is justifiable ; but still we think his arguments militate against the practice. In replying to those who connect the idea of regeneration in all cases with infant baptism, he argues that this is “ to affirm nothing less than the rule which we gather from the recorded instances of Scripture to have existed at the first, has been formally abrogated, and another established in its place” (p. 232) ; that is to say, as baptism was first administered to adults, who believed the preaching of the Word, and were then engrafted into Christ by baptism on the previous condition of repentance and faith, it would be an abrogation of this scriptural

rule if infants were to be engrafted into Christ by baptism. "A system which involves a formal change in the process whereby salvation was originally made the property of individuals, must, if it is to maintain itself, be able to produce a divine prescription superseding that which, at the first, was given" (p. 232). We own that, to our humble apprehension, this argument goes to prove infant baptism unlawful. Of course we cannot produce a divine prescription *superseding* that which at the first was given. He further on states that, "the assertions that infant baptism is a divine, or, at any rate, an undoubted apostolical ordinance," are "made with singular disregard of the real difficulties, both doctrinal and historical, connected with the subject" (p. 234). He holds, however, that though we are not warranted, in the absence of any evidence of the divine or apostolical institution of infant baptism, in making any dogmatical statements upon its *effects* (p. 237), it is nevertheless justifiable from Scripture; and he accordingly justifies them from Scripture.

Now it really seems to be, after all, no very unreasonable opinion, that if infant baptism be justifiable from Scripture, or, in other words, if it be really in accordance with the will of God, it has some effect of a spiritual nature, corresponding to the effect admitted to follow in the case of adults. For otherwise we should suppose that baptism, which in the case of adults is by Divine institution the ordinary means of engrafting into Christ, may lawfully, and in accordance with God's will, be applied equally to infants, and yet have no effect at all on them. Why even Mr. Gorham admits, that regeneration *may* take place in infant baptism. It is universally allowed that by infant baptism persons *may* be engrafted into Christ; that many actually *are* so. Is it reasonable to imagine that it is lawful, by God's word, to administer baptism to infants, and that baptism so administered conveys no blessing, and no grace? Is it in their case a mere outward form, though it is in accordance with the Divine will? Assuredly it seems but reasonable, that when infant baptism is admitted to be *scriptural*, and in accordance with God's will, and when it is also admitted that in many instances it *does* produce spiritual effects, and consequently that infants are *capable of such effects*, it should be further conceded that infant baptism does, like adult baptism, produce certain effects, does engraft into Christ, *is* the outward sign of regeneration, but of regeneration in such a sense alone as is *possible* in the case of infants. Infants cannot in any instance be regenerate to the same extent as adults, because they have no actual sins to repent of; nor can the Word of God turn them from the darkness of error to the light of truth. To draw a distinction between the extent of

change included in adult and infant regeneration respectively, appears simply unavoidable in the nature of things.

We must now bring these remarks to a close. On some important points we have not hesitated to express our dissent from the writer of the work before us; but we are sensible of the value of his labours, and of the additional materials for thought which he has supplied in connexion with one of the most important subjects at present under discussion.

The value of his work appears to us to lie in its tendency to raise the mind above the merely external and formal aspect of the Church of Christ, to its more immediate relations with its Divine Head. It directs us to the vital essence of the Church, to the idea and the reality of that Divine institution, as pervaded and influenced by the Spirit of God, as the primary idea, and to the outward manifestations of that spiritual commonwealth as a secondary and subordinate feature. It connects with the highest scriptural promises and characteristics of the Christian community, that inner body of Christ on earth, which is justified, and sanctified, and redeemed, and animated by a common faith, subject to a common Head, and inspired by a common charity. And it teaches us to look for an imperfect realization, nay, possibly for no realization at times of the characteristics of this spiritual body in the outward Church. We hold this to be in general a view which is calculated to spiritualize the mind, and to open larger and more philosophical, as well as more scriptural views, than any exclusive dwelling on the Church, in its mere external form, can ever lead to. The latter view has a tendency to formalism; and this essential formalism will still adhere to the view, even though its advocates may seek to escape from their conscious deficiency, by investing forms with a spiritual character, which does not rightfully belong to them; an attempt which, after all, leads to the mere resting in forms, and restrains the mind from apprehending those high realities, of which outward forms are but the subordinate agents and manifestations.

ART. V.—1. *Remedies suggested for some of the Evils which constitute the Perils of the Nation.* London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley, 1844.

2. *The Rookeries of London, Past, Present, and Prospective.* By the Rev. THOMAS BEAMES, M.A. Hatchards, 1850.

3. *England, her Colonies, and her Enemies.* By E. G. ATHERLEY, Esq. Ridgway, 1848.

To those among our clergy whose lot is cast in the more closely-populated districts of our towns and cities, and perhaps in the majority of cases in agricultural districts also, few questions will make a more urgent appeal for their sympathy, and aid, where aid is possible, than that of the amelioration of the social condition of the working classes. The extreme poverty of our poor—the wretched state and miserably scanty proportions of their dwellings—the insufficiency both of food and clothing which is so usual among them—their life of unremitting toil, leaving little or no proper time for the culture of the intellect or the taste—their consequently more or less brutalized condition in, at least, too many instances—their lack of proper self-respect—their careless, imprudent, and frequently irreligious and immoral habits of life—all these things, and many more of the same sad nature, are found to hang together and to exercise a constant influence upon one another, by those who have an opportunity of watching the working classes, and especially by all who discharge their pastoral office with care and vigilance. We believe that clergymen of the English Church will for the more part be disposed to admit that they despair of effecting any very great change for the better in the habits of living of the poorest class of their parishioners until these latter are raised in the social scale—until their dwellings are vastly improved, and the common decencies of life are consequently respected by them—until they learn to aim at something more than bare existence, and so have time and thought, as it were, to devote to the service of their God.

What can be expected from a population, the mass of which, in our larger towns and cities, and, to a great extent, in the agricultural districts also, are so unfortunately circumstanced as our own? When we find seven or eight families in one not very large dwelling, each of those families containing from six to seven members on an average, what habits of common propriety, of

ordinary cleanliness, of Christian decency, can be expected to exist? Yet this state of things is common in many, very many districts of the metropolis, as Mr. Beames's valuable work on "The Rookeries" assures us, and will be discovered in all the larger towns of our manufacturing districts, as well as in many other towns and cities. Again; in the very country, as that work on "the Perils of the Nation," which we have placed, amongst others, at the head of these remarks, establishes beyond the possibility of cavil, the agricultural peasantry are for the more part so miserably housed that entire families are forced to pig together—we can find no equally appropriate phrase—and decency becomes, in point of fact, impossible. No doubt, since that book was written, important changes have been effected for the better; and all honour to the noblemen and gentlemen by whom this reformation has been commenced. Still, the insufficiency of housing for our working classes is one of the most prominently offensive symptoms of the fatal nature of poverty amongst us; for, we hold that this is a symptom only; the cause, indeed, in some respects, but at the same time a consequence of other great social evils.

But looking at the working classes as they are, seeing the way in which they are still housed for the more part, and in which they live, we say, let the Church be as energetic as she may, she cannot achieve physical miracles; she cannot very greatly raise a population which is thus far degraded in its social state. The good effect of her teaching, the influence of her schools and churches, is necessarily counteracted by want, misery, and brutality. The child we have been training, for instance, to the use of decent language, and to the reverence for sacred things, returns home to hear curses and ribaldry on the lips of those whom he is bound to love and obey; and this is the consequence of the parents' social degradation. As the younger *male* generation, at all events, pass from under our direct influence in order to work with their fathers, they, in the great majority of cases, turn their backs, we fear, on all the moral and religious training they have previously received. The *men* of our working classes, in our towns and cities at least, rarely enter a church; and why? because their minds are embittered by a sense of their misery, and an indistinct consciousness of wrong; and they, not altogether unnaturally, prefer to drown the remembrance of their supposed grievances in the enjoyment of the "social cup."

How are these things to be remedied? By building new churches, and throwing them open to all comers? By increasing the number of our clergy? By improving and enlarging our

schools? By having frequent, almost constant, services? Very desirable, and very beneficial, doubtless, in their way are all these good things, as we sought to establish but recently in our comments upon Mr. Monro's "Parochial Work;" and Heaven forbid that a single word should fall from us calculated to damp the ardour of our more energetic town or country pastors, or to chill their earnest lay coadjutors. But we must warn men fairly, in the name and in the true interest of our dear Mother Church of England, not to expect *physical* miracles, as we have said; not to demand impossibilities, not to look for what can *not* be. We may do much, doubtless, to alleviate moral and religious evil by spiritual means; but that evil is the consequence, for the more part, of social want—want of good housing, want of constant employment, want of good wages, want of proper leisure, want of food, want of clothing, want of all things.

Now, two of those publications, the titles of which we have placed at the head of our remarks, which treat of the evils that affect the working classes, and suggest "remedies," may be said to have made their appearance at a somewhat inauspicious period—when the late ministry, namely, were in office; for we cannot but feel that, however good might and may be their intentions, the so-called "Whigs" have not as yet done much to promote the welfare of the working classes, nor have ever evinced (we regret to say it) any very strong sympathy with them in their sufferings; we cannot but remember that the New Poor Law is identified with their policy, and that it is they who, by the ruthless application of Mr. Malthus's principles, have robbed our rural population to so large an extent, in times now bygone, of their lawful dwellings. Still, we do not wish to pass any sentence upon the good intentions of other men, and doubtless many members of the Liberal party are most earnestly desirous of adding to the comforts of their poorer brethren.

It falls to our lot, however, to notice these remedial publications at what, we trust, may prove a more auspicious period; for, without building our confidence too much upon princes or on great men, we cannot but feel assured that our present noble-hearted premier is most anxious, as far as in him lies, to fulfil the promise which he gave us in his first great speech after his accession to office, delivered in the House of Lords, on the 29th of February, when he told us that his chief aim, and that of his ministry, would be to "improve the condition and increase the comforts of the people," and to "advance the social, moral, and religious improvement of the country."

No doubt such words may mean little or nothing on the lips of a mere politician; but, in Lord Derby's case, we feel convinced

that they expressed a reality, and that the interest of the working classes will no longer be sacrificed to those new-fangled, and, for the more part, hardhearted economical tenets of Malthus, Martineau, and Co., of which Mr. Kingsley has very pertinently said, "A doctrine is these men's God; touch but that shrine, and lo! your simpering philanthropist becomes as ruthless as a Dominican."

We do venture to hope, we say, that an earnest effort will be now made to improve the condition of the working classes, and that this effort to effect a great and marked improvement will form a prominent feature in the future policy of the Derby administration. Lord Derby's words were not mere words of form; they had a meaning, we rest assured; and, if further proof were needed, which it is not, we should have it in the declaration made by his genial and far-sighted chancellor of the exchequer, Mr. Disraeli, who, addressing the electors of Buckinghamshire, and speaking of the policy of that cabinet of which he forms so distinguished a member, observed, "We shall endeavour to terminate that strife of classes which of late years has exercised so pernicious an influence;" evidently meaning, we should suppose, that it was the intention of the present administration, by alleviating the sufferings and improving the condition of the working classes, to do their best to eradicate all feelings of ill-will on their part towards their more fortunate brethren.

We doubt not, therefore, that the Derby administration cherishes the most honourable designs for the welfare of the working classes, whilst we cannot conceal from ourselves that there is an enormous work to be achieved. Almost might the heart of the statesman sink within him, when he contemplates the extent of our existing social evils, some of which we have already faintly indicated. Where and how to begin the process of improvement and renovation is indeed the all-important question, to the solution of which, as far as in us lies, we propose to devote the remainder of these cursory remarks; though, after all, we must be only held to speak suggestively, and so to contribute our modest quota towards the general store.

Many good Churchmen seem to imagine, then, as we have already indicated, that a sufficient number of additional schools and churches would assuredly achieve the whole of the moral and religious work that lies before us. Our own impression is, that they who think thus are very much mistaken. We refer our readers, for much general and valuable information upon this subject, to the publication which stands first upon our list; a perusal of which cannot, we think, fail to convince every unprejudiced inquirer, that neither schools nor churches can be of very essential

service, so long as the social state of the working classes remains what it now too generally is ; so long, to confine ourselves to some one point in the first instance, as the residences of the working classes are so miserably insufficient for the poor man's needs as they are at present—such narrow, dirty, unhappy-looking tenements, unfit, in too many instances, for human beings, and consequently disgraceful to a Christian government and nation. In proof of this melancholy fact, though it can, unhappily, require very little demonstration, we will cull a few extracts from the work before us :—

“As a general result,” says this author, “of a very cursory glance over these six counties (Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Hampshire, Suffolk, and Sussex), we find that, in 1801, 2551 families were accommodated in 2375 dwellings, leaving only 176 to seek for the shelter of a house not their own. But in 1831, the families are found to have increased to 3307, while the dwellings are *reduced* to 2401 ! leaving 1266 to be only sharers in the shelter of a roof. Thus the families have increased by 756, but the dwellings have been reduced by 334 ! The consequences are inevitable. Mr. Austin, one of the commissioners, says, ‘The consequences of the want of proper accommodation for sleeping in the cottages are seen in the early licentiousness of the rural districts—licentiousness which has not always respected the family relationship. Universally in the villages where the cottages are the most crowded there are the greatest number of illegitimate children, and generally the greatest depravity of manners.’ How indeed could it be otherwise ? Let any one endeavour to realize the fact described by a poor labourer's wife to the Assistant Poor-Law Commissioner, and given by him at p. 91 of the *Evidence of the Employment of Women in Agriculture*. This poor woman, Rachel Hayward, says, ‘There are eleven of us in our family—myself, my husband, three daughters, and six sons. We have two rooms, one down stairs, and the other up stairs over it. We all sleep in the bedroom.’”—pp. 405—407.

Again, we find a graphic description of the too usual state of the poor in the rural districts from the pen of the clerk to the Stafford Union, on pages 255-7 of this same work :—

“If we follow the agricultural labourer into his miserable dwelling, we shall find it consisting of two rooms only ; the day-room, in addition to the family, contains the cooking utensils, the washing apparatus, agricultural implements, and dirty clothes, the windows broken and stuffed full of rags. In the sleeping apartment, the parents and their children, boys and girls, are indiscriminately mixed, and frequently a lodger sleeping in the same and the only room ; generally no window ; the openings in the half-thatched roof admit light, and expose the family to every vicissitude of the weather ; the liability of the children so situated to contagious maladies frequently plunges the family into the greatest misery. The husband, enjoying but little *comfort* under

his own roof, resorts to the beer-shop, neglects the cultivation of his garden, and impoverishes his family. The children are brought up without any regard to decency of behaviour, to habits of foresight or self-restraint; they make indifferent servants; the girls become the mothers of bastards, and return home a burden to their parents or to the parish, and fill the workhouse. The boys spend the Christmas week's holiday and their wages in the beer-shop, and enter upon their new situation in rags; soon tired of the restraint imposed upon them under the roof of their master, they leave his service before the termination of the year's engagement, and seek employment as day-labourers, not with a view of improving their condition, but with a desire to receive and spend their earnings weekly in a beer-shop; associating with the worst of characters, they become the worst of labourers, resort to poaching, commit petty thefts, and add to the county-rates by commitments and prosecutions."

Not a cheering state of things, assuredly, but a most ignominious one for this country: and yet, can it be said that in the majority of instances the picture is overdrawn? We think not. In large towns and cities matters are, if possible, still worse. We might draw largely on Mr. Beames's very interesting work for the corroboration of this assertion, as far as the metropolis is concerned; but we really do not think it needful to establish at any length what nobody can deny—that large families are constantly found living and sleeping in a single room, so as to surpass in wretchedness the inhabitants of the agricultural districts—seven or eight families residing in a house. The consequent growth of immorality and crime needs no demonstration; and even where there is no positive profligacy, how can any delicacy of thought and feeling be expected to exist under such circumstances? How should children's minds remain innocent? How should their words be modest? How should they respect their parents? How should the parents be able to exercise a due moral influence over their children? How should any habits of regularity or cleanliness be attained? How should the practice of private prayer survive amidst such evil influences? How should a population thus housed, whether in town or country, but especially in the former, be expected to attend the public services of the Church, or to derive much benefit from them, if they so attended? There is but one answer possible to all these questions; or, rather, they are not to be answered. May we not, then, be suffered to assume that the present wretched abodes of the working classes are fruitful sources of immorality and crime?—nay, that this evil is of so gigantic and wide-spreading a nature, that until something is done to alleviate and remove it, we cannot expect to work any great change for the better in the habits and feelings of our working-classes, by the aid of even thrice the present number of clergy, schools, and churches? Surely, surely,

before any serious improvement in the moral and religious condition of the people can be effected, this frightful source of wretchedness must be removed—a great and marked improvement must be made in their dwellings. In any direct application, therefore, of assistance to the working classes for the improvement of their condition, we are disposed to maintain that the first consideration should be the providing them with proper dwelling-houses.

The author of the work from which we have already quoted at some length, proposes to effect this great work by adopting the plan of Mr. Sadler, a truly great man, whose memory we hold in the highest honour,—

“Which proposed to appoint in every parish, one or more guardians or protectors of the poor, the clergyman being one, for the express purpose of providing the labourer with a proper dwelling, and with a piece of garden ground: the said functionaries were to have been empowered to take, on lease or otherwise, a suitable piece of land for cottage-allotments, and to make rules for the governance of the same: also to build, or cause to be built, any new cottages that might be needed, *obtaining the requisite funds, if in no other way attainable, by application to the Exchequer Bill Commissioners.*”—pp. 247-8.

Concerning this project our author says:—

“There need be no wonder that a plan thus complete and effectual startled, by its novelty and extent, the majority of public men, and stood no chance of being speedily carried. Yet we entirely believe that its immediate adoption, even now, would be, not only the most desirable, on the whole, but also the most prudent and cautious mode of operation that could be adopted.”—p. 248.

In case of this not proving practicable, the writer, however, proceeds to advise that great private exertions should be made to found societies for the purpose of working out the allotment system.

And, assuredly, if our country be already so wealthy, as this author maintains, and as many of our contemporaries are in the habit of asserting—if the nation labours under a plethora of wealth, and the great practical need of our age and country is not an increase in our national stores, but simply a better distribution of them—IF this be the case, which we take leave on our part to doubt, why then, assuredly, nothing could be more reasonable than that the Government should provide dwellings of a suitable character for the working classes at the public expense, wherever that be needful, out of our already accumulated stores of capital, making the wealthier classes bear the costs.

But we are inclined to differ seriously, on this point, from the author of this interesting and philanthropic work, and to believe with the writer of that singularly powerful pamphlet which

stands third upon our list, that, although there is a vast amount of wealth in this country, we are, upon the whole, not a wealthy nation; and that, for this very intelligible reason, that our amount of useful produce is insufficient to meet the wants of our people. Therefore we confess that we should greatly prefer the adding to our national stores, and assisting the working classes from such additional resources, to the impoverishing one class in order to enrich another, and injuring the higher and middle classes to benefit their poorer brethren. No doubt, looking at the gigantic evils which stare us in the face, we should be prepared to maintain that *if* no means could be devised for the increase of our national stores, sacrifices, great sacrifices even, must be made by the comparatively prosperous to assist their suffering brethren; but we are inclined to believe that it is in our power, with little difficulty, largely to increase our national resources—to add to our permanent national wealth; and we are disposed to conceive that the country may be under no small obligation to Mr. Atherley for the very valuable suggestions, on this head, contained in that pamphlet of his which lies before us.

We will not undertake to assert that the remedies here suggested are infallible, or that the scheme must work; but this we will say, that theoretically, at least, this policy seems to us to meet in the main the requirements of the case, and that it is, at all events, worthy of a very attentive consideration.

After demonstrating, then, at some length, and as we think clearly, that the distress which prevailed at the time the pamphlet was written, and which, more or less, prevails at all times amongst the working classes of this country, and that almost every other social evil with which Great Britain is afflicted, proceeded and proceed from a deficiency, and a very large deficiency, in our national supplies (of bread, corn, meat, and other articles of food), the author of this pamphlet proceeds to recommend the establishment of what he terms "*CORN COLONIES*," as the only politic and effectual remedy for our various national maladies. He proposes that such corn colonies should consist of large quantities of the fine and fertile, but at present waste and useless lands of our North American, Australian, and African possessions; that the Government should cause such lands to be brought into cultivation; that they should be divided into farms of 300 or 400 acres each; that suitable farm-buildings should be erected on each farm; that a skilful farmer should be placed there; and that all the corn and other produce of the said "*colonies*" should be imported into Great Britain and Ireland, except what might be required for the support of those who should be engaged in the cultivation and management of the corn colonies.

Now this does appear to us, in the main, to be a tangible and an important proposition for the increase of our national stores, and we hail the idea, accordingly, as one that may be turned to great advantage.

We are inclined to doubt, indeed, the expediency of making the Government the direct possessor or cultivator of these colonial lands. Mr. Atherley suggests that this measure may be carried into execution upon a large scale, without borrowing much money for the purpose; for he proposes that the corn and other produce of the land that is brought into cultivation the first year, should be applied (or rather the money arising from the sale of such produce) to the purpose of bringing more land into cultivation in the second year, so as to enlarge the sphere of operations yearly until the undertaking was completed, or at least was carried out to so great an extent as to need no immediate widening of the extent of cultivated soil. To facilitate, however, the speedy success of the policy, and bring it to bear upon our national distresses, he advises a liberal outlay of borrowed money during the first two or three years, observing that a single year's produce of these corn colonies, when completed, would be sure to cover such an outlay.

The writer of this pamphlet then proceeds to mention some of the chief purposes to which he would apply this increase in the public wealth, and first amongst these is enumerated the improvement of the dwellings of the working classes, both in town and country. But before we notice his observations under this head, we must repeat that, while we consider the suggestion of corn colonies to be practically important, we should doubt the advisability of the Government becoming an owner on so enormous a scale, and thus possessing itself of such an immense amount of patronage. Another suggestion which we have heard upon this subject is, that grants of colonial lands might be made to the various poor-law districts in our country, or rather, to their guardians and commissioners in charge for them, with a view to the eventual relief of the poor-rates—a portion of those rates being employed, in the first instance, for the cultivation of the land. The rate-payers, were this policy acted upon, would become the actual proprietors of these vast colonial estates; the guardians and commissioners would, of course, import the produce into this country in their name, and would there sell it at the usual market price; the proceeds would then be devoted to the relief of the poor-rates by providing for the comforts of the working classes, and, first of all, perhaps, by the improvement of their dwellings. But, whatever be the direct agency employed for the execution of this project, the idea in itself of the founding of corn colonies does

seem to us to be a happy one—an idea which meets the exigencies of our age and country better than any other with which we are acquainted. For such a substantial increase in our national wealth must manifestly bring with it a great gain to all classes; employment would then receive the strongest impetus; increased wealth would be followed, and must be followed, by an increased demand for labour of every kind; the value of labour, therefore, would rise in the home-market; and so the great problem would be partially solved, on the solution of which depends the happiness and the moral and religious well-being of the working-classes, as well as the welfare and safety of the state.

Whether the ratepayers, then, or the distressed classes already alluded to, became the direct owners of these colonial lands, so much additional wealth would manifestly be secured by bringing them into cultivation, without any proportionate increase in the colonial population (this latter circumstance being, indeed, an essential to the successful working of the scheme); and our wealth being thus largely increased, it does seem to us that an important surplus might possibly remain to be devoted to great national purposes.

We cannot see, therefore, that Mr. Atherley is as utopian as he might, at first sight, be imagined in proposing that the income that would arise from the cultivation, upon this system, of seven or eight millions of acres in the colonies should be applied to the purposes of—

“Pulling down, and rebuilding in a handsome manner, all the bad, confined, and unhealthy parts of London, and of other towns and cities; supplying all towns with plenty of good water; surrounding them with public parks and pleasure-grounds (for which the ground may, of course, be more easily spared, if the corn colony scheme be adopted); building schools, colleges, and places of religious worship; building and furnishing excellent residences (not ‘cottages’) for the working classes (annexing, where practicable, a plot of ground to each residence); making harbours and breakwaters; draining, planting with forest trees, and otherwise improving the bogs, heaths, moors, and mountains of Great Britain and Ireland; and in other useful public undertakings.”—pp. 10, 11.

Here is an important list, indeed, of public measures, and if only half of this could be effected, doubtless, corn colonies would confer the most inestimable benefit on us. And we should say, that much might be effected, in the course of a few years, with the income, or “capital,” arising from the cultivation of seven or eight millions of acres. Such increase of the national wealth might be efficiently applied, we should say, to the providing the working classes with good residences. Of course, we do not

propose that these should be absolutely given to them; but that they should be let at moderate rents, as they well might be, so as to relieve the industrious working man from one of the most unjust burdens which he at present sustains—the paying of a very large rent for the most miserable accommodation.

It is obvious, indeed, that if such a plan as this were acted on, house property of a certain description would be greatly diminished in value, and finally might become almost valueless; but we can only say, that so it ought to be. However, some compensation, and even a liberal compensation might be made to the owners, if that were considered needful (they are usually small shopkeepers, who are exceedingly grasping and oppressive landlords, and who make a speculation of the very existence of the poor); and then it must be remembered that such a social change as is here contemplated would, after all, occupy a period of many years. This consideration of loss to individuals, we may further observe, is of little weight, compared with the enormous national benefits to be derived from the providing of fit and comfortable dwellings for the working classes; for a real improvement in this respect would, we are assured, pave the way for the social elevation, at all points, of the great body of the English people.

Another not unimportant suggestion made by this author, of which we ought not to omit all mention, is, that numerous and comfortable asylums should be erected in pleasant and healthy situations for the aged, infirm, and ill-provided for, of the working classes, and that such asylums should be endowed with considerable estates in the proposed corn colonies. He proceeds:—

“The entire management of the asylums, their estates and revenues, should be vested in trustees or committees, chosen by the working classes of the respective districts to which the asylums belonged. The working classes, as a body, would thus become extensive landowners; would have a large stake in the country and a deep interest in the colonies; and, having such an interest, their services in the defence of both colonies and mother-country would, we may be sure, never be withheld when necessary.”

Further; our author remarks, that although the first object in founding corn colonies is to make good *an existing deficiency*, there is manifestly no reason why we should stand still at our present point; but that it must be rather advisable that our population and supplies should both continually increase. For how, otherwise, he asks, can we expect to keep pace as a nation, *or as a maritime power*, with our gigantic Transatlantic rival? This remarkable pamphlet contains much and powerful reasoning upon this score, for which we refer our readers to its pages. Of course we need not say that the writer is opposed to emigration on any very extensive scale as needless, and therefore worse than needless.

The more thickly populated our country is, so much the better, he says, as long as our supplies are more than sufficient for our needs ; as long as our national wealth exceeds our national demand. Mr. Atherley further points out the great danger of our losing our distant colonies, and with them our chief sources of increased wealth and strength, if we encourage emigration, upon a large scale, to them. Give your population sufficient employment at home, he says ; feed them well, and educate and instruct them, morally and religiously, and then they are better here than in your colonies. And thus far, we confess, we are inclined to agree with him.

The projector of this remarkable policy further proposes the making extensive grants of corn land in the colonies to those who have rendered important services to their country, as well as to men who have been injured, without any fault of theirs, by legislative enactments, such as those of Sir Robert Peel in connexion with the currency ; also, to the ancient possessors of the soil in Ireland ; attaching, as a condition to all these grants, that the grantees should reside at home, and not in the colonies. We will not canvass the feasibility of this proposition, which is, of course, a secondary matter ; certainly we should be glad to see justice done to some of the oldest families in the country, whether in this or in the sister island, but there are manifest practical difficulties in the way.

However this may be, we do most strongly call attention to the Corn Colonies project, as a whole. Standing, as we now do, on the brink of a general election, we invite the attention of electors of our country to this important scheme of policy, begging them to ponder on the inadvisability of deriving well-nigh half the necessities of life from foreign soils, as at present ; and the expediency of drawing our supplies from our own land, whether at home or in the colonies ; land, *i. e.* belonging to British landowners, cultivated by British industry, the produce of which would be sold in this country, and the proceeds of which sales would go into our countrymen's pockets. We repeat that this scheme for the increase of our supplies seems to us a great, a bold, and a comprehensive suggestion ; even such a suggestion as the country stands in need of. And more especially do we invite the attention of the Derby administration and its noble-hearted Premier to the proposed Corn Colonies. Might not these indeed help to furnish the means of realizing their patriotic intentions for the "improvement of the condition of the people ?" We are sure that we need not urge upon the Clergy the importance of any project which appears calculated to alleviate the social miseries of the Working Classes, and therefore almost necessarily to exercise a happy influence upon our national morality and national religion.

ART. VI.—*Annotations on the Apostolical Epistles, designed chiefly for the Use of Students of the Greek Text.* By THOMAS WILLIAMSON PEILE, D.D., Head Master of Repton School, late Fellow and Tutor in the University of Durham, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In 4 vols. 8vo. London: Rivingtons.

It is not in a spirit of boasting, but in one of gratitude, that we are enabled to dwell upon the consolatory fact, that no nation on the face of the earth is more deeply impressed by feelings of reverence and love for the written word of God than our own. This great characteristic of the British people manifests itself not merely in professions, but in efforts of unparalleled magnitude for the diffusion of the Scriptures; in the training of the young in the knowledge of the Bible; and in the remarkable and perfect knowledge which is possessed of the sacred text by multitudes of religious persons in all classes. The national spirit of reverence for the inspired Word of God, is a subject of ridicule and scorn to those who would substitute the authority of man for that of God's word, and would subject its interpretation to the decisions of a human authority usurping the attribute of infallibility, or of a private inspiration. But long may that reverence for God's word, that "Bibliolatry," as it is termed, continue the characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon race! Every believer must prefer it, even with its occasional extravagances, to the anti-christian systems which seek to replace it.

The Scriptures are, in this country, received to a very great extent, in the right spirit. They are not received in a spirit of criticism; in the spirit which subjects them to the tortures of a scientific analysis, and judges of them on principles, and with the aid of philosophical attainments, which are wholly alien to the mind of those who wrote, and of those who first received the Scriptures. They are accepted with reverence as God's word, and in a religious spirit, which seeks to gather from them that instruction which is addressed alike to the unlearned and the learned; an instruction which comprises mysteries indeed; but not such as can be solved by human science, or disentangled by mental subtlety.

Confessedly the Scripture has its difficulties, and serious difficulties in many parts, arising from the obscurity of allusions to customs and events long since passed into oblivion, and also from

its abrupt and parenthetical style, and trains of argument which it is frequently most hard to follow. Nor does any part of the Scripture furnish more remarkable instances of difficulties of this kind than the Epistles of St. Paul; difficulties which even St. Peter himself acknowledges; and which have exercised the faculties, and divided the opinions of the ablest and most eminent expositors of Scripture in every age. Perhaps, indeed, it is not intended that the full meaning of every part of these wonderful and sublime writings should be known until their inspired Author shall Himself explain them face to face in the world to come. Yet still, much, very much, of the meaning of passages which present apparent contradictions, has been unveiled by the patient labour of expositors and critics. But commentaries may be distributed into several classes, in reference to the different attainments and circumstances of students of the sacred Scriptures. At present, a commentary, which is really adapted for the use of the more intelligent *poor*, appears to be a desideratum. We have seen a work of this kind compiled from the commentaries of Scott and Henry by the Tract Society, which appears to be the best approximation we have seen to such a commentary; but its object is almost entirely practical and spiritual, and though on the whole a very useful and pleasing compilation, it does not exactly meet what is required. Of commentaries for the middle classes we have several in circulation, such as those of D'Oyly and Mant, or the Christian Knowledge Society, the commentaries of Girdlestone, Henry, Scott, all of which are works of standard merit, besides others of smaller dimensions. And then, finally, we come to commentaries of the character of the work before us. The class of students of the Greek text of Scripture is, of course, comparatively limited; and it is evident that a commentary adapted for their use must take a very different shape from one that is adapted for the public at large. It may fairly presuppose, on the part of the reader, not only a knowledge of the Greek text of the New Testament, but an acquaintance in general with classical literature; and it may bring to the illustration of the Scriptures many allusions and facts which must be, to some extent, beyond the reach of the ordinary English reader. Not merely this; but a commentary of this nature will enter on many questions which the spirit of a learned criticism has raised in connexion with the sacred text; and will supply the clergy and the more educated laity with the means not merely of explaining the Scripture, but of defending its veracity or its integrity against captious objections. In this interesting field the labours of Bloomfield, Burton, Macknight, Slade, and Whitby, are well

known and highly appreciated; and to these distinguished names we have now to add that of the learned author of the volumes before us, Dr. Peile.

This comment of Dr. Peile on St. Paul's Epistles is comprised in four octavo volumes, and is considerably fuller than any of those which are in general circulation; for it does not comprise the text of the Epistles or any paraphrase on them, but consists simply of annotations on them verse by verse. The object of Dr. Peile, as stated by himself, in his preface, is to promote the study of the Epistles in the original Greek; and he suggests to the student the perusal of each chapter in the first instance in the original, and then a reference to the annotations for the solution of any difficulties which may have presented themselves. The principal sources from which these annotations have been drawn, in addition to the author's own contributions, are thus detailed in the preface:—

“And now, in conclusion—beseeching the reader for his own sake to open first a Greek (or better, if a Greek and English) Testament, and when he has read through and reflected upon an entire chapter, and ascertained for himself what *things* there may be in it *hard to be understood*, then to seek for such assistance as (under grace) this book may be able to supply—the author has to acknowledge his own large obligations to those better-known authorities, from whom he has, in like manner, sought and obtained assistance for himself; and for his readers, no unseasonable relief from the dryness of a philological and grammatical style of interpretation. To the learned and indefatigable Mac-knight, to Mr. (now Bishop) Terrott's Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle to the Romans, and not unfrequently to some suggestive remark in Burton's edition of the Greek Testament, it will be seen how much he is indebted. Nor is he ashamed here to confess himself a debtor to one who styles himself an ‘*Emeritus Professor*’ among those Protestant Dissenters whose pastors are trained at the Academy at Homerton—inasmuch as in Mr. Walford's *Curæ Romanæ* he finds no sectarian views which should mar its general usefulness, but rather so much essential unity of Christian doctrine, that we may well *love as brethren; following after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another*.

“Above all others, however, his thanks are due to a Transatlantic Professor, mighty in the interpretation of the Old Testament Scriptures, and eloquent in the exposition of the New—a man fervent in spirit, exact in the letter of the Greek text, eminently pious in the remarks, eminently practical in the conclusions which he has drawn up for his readers—who yet, in the very opening of his otherwise invaluable *Commentary on the Romans*, is found to assert that ‘the word *called* in the Epistles of the New Testament uniformly expresses the idea of an effectual calling, or of a selection and appointment—in fact a choice, a

taking one from among many; and so to be *called*, is to be *chosen*:' and anon, as was to be expected from this beginning, that 'God chooses certain individuals, and predestinates them to eternal life; ch. viii. 29. Those who are thus chosen, shall certainly be saved; ver. 30. The gift of Christ is not the result of the mere general love of God to the human family, but also of special love to His own people; ver. 32.—The reason of Pharaoh's being left to perish, while others were saved, was not that he was worse than others, but because *God has mercy on whom He will have mercy*; it was because, among the criminals at His bar, He pardons one and not another, as seems good in His sight; ch. ix. 17. Paul teaches clearly the doctrine of the personal election of men to eternal life; ver. 18.'

"*A little leaven, we know, hath power to leaven the whole lump*; but far from intending in the present instance to convey any such impression—far from seeking by means of these extracts to condemn the entire book from which so much interesting and instructive matter has been transferred to his own pages—the writer of this Preface would rather indulge the hope that, should the present publication have the good fortune to arrest the attention of Mr. Hodge, he may be led (it may be) to reconsider and revise what, as it now stands, accords not with the general soundness and comprehensiveness of his views respecting St. Paul's doctrine; but is to be traced rather to that stumbling-stone to too many interpreters of Scripture, ADHERENCE TO A PRECONCEIVED SYSTEM OF THEOLOGY."—pp. xiii.—xv.

It will be observed that, in the foregoing passage, Dr. Peile deprecates the influence exercised by a preconceived system of theology, as prejudicial to the right interpretation of Scripture. This, undoubtedly, does in many cases prevent the full perception of Scripture truth. Yet it is not possible, in the nature of things, that persons should come to the study of God's word without certain opinions. In fact, the Scriptures were addressed to those who had already been taught the truths of the Gospel. All that can be meant, therefore, is, that whatever be our preconceived opinions, we must not attempt to wrest the Scripture into accordance with these opinions, but must be willing to yield them to the clear and evident teaching of God's word.

Dr. Peile's work, as we have remarked, consists simply of a series of annotations, verse by verse, on the Greek text of the Epistles. We believe, therefore, that the mode by which we shall most readily enable the reader to determine the nature and value of his labours will be to adopt the course which he has himself indicated—to select some passages which present difficulties of interpretation, and to quote his annotations on those passages, and compare them with those of other commentators. This we shall accordingly proceed to attempt.

We have been tempted to enter on the examination of the

well-known passages in Romans viii. and ix., which bear on the doctrine of election; but we abstain from doing so, because it would take up a larger space than is at our command, and also because of the deep mysteriousness of the subject altogether. We will therefore commence by referring to his remarks on 1 Cor. vii. 10 and 12, where there is an apparent difficulty in the Apostle's directions on the subject of marriage: "yet not I, but the Lord;" and "to the rest speak I, not the Lord." On these passages Dr. Peile has the following remarks:—

"10. But to the married I say, or rather not I, but Christ (for it is our Lord's own injunction), '*Let not the wife, &c.*' So Bishop Shuttleworth paraphrases this verse, and 'as Usteri has well remarked, the Apostle here does not distinguish between commandments proceeding from himself and those proceeding from Divine Inspiration, but between what *he* was commissioned to teach for the first time and what was already known by tradition.' Billroth—who adds, 'respecting women separating themselves (*μὴ χωρισθῆναι*, *ne separet se ipsam*; *ἐὰν δὲ καὶ χωρισθῇ*, *quod si separaverit se*. Scriptores Hebraizantes ad conjugationem Hithpahel exprimendam non possunt nisi verbis passivis et mediis uti'—Küttner) from their husbands, Christ Himself gave no *express* recorded direction, but said only (Mark x. 11) that a woman who had been divorced from her husband, and married another, was guilty of adultery; and (ibid. 9) that what God had joined, man must not separate. With regard to men, however, He has Himself (Matt. v. 32; xix. 9) expressly laid down the command of the Apostle; thus giving his verdict in favour of the interpretation of Deut. xxiv. 1, contended for by the School of Shammai."—Vol. i. pp. 224, 225.

The annotation here is shorter than that in Macknight's Commentary, and, we think, preferable altogether. The latter, however, concurs in assigning the same explanation to the passage, as also does Whitby's Commentary.

The important text which follows in the 14th verse of the same chapter, "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy,"—a passage bearing on Infant Baptism—is thus explained:—

"*For the unbelieving husband has been made clean in the person of his believing wife*—for, in the sight of God, 'they are no more twain, but one flesh'—*and the unbelieving wife has been made clean in the person of her believing husband*: for otherwise it would follow that your children are unclean in the sight of God, whereas in reality (*ῥῶν*, *uti res se habet*,) *they are clean* in His sight—'for the promise,' declares that Apostle whom God first taught by a special vision (Acts x. 28) to call no human being common or unclean, the promise of the means of grace and salvation through Christ, 'is unto you and to your children, and to

all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call ;' Acts ii. 39. But with what words does St. Peter preface this most gracious declaration ? *'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost ;'* *ibid.* 38. And what said the Apostles and Primitive Church of Christ, when, silenced by the revelation which Peter had made known to them, they glorified God for His mercy to the heathen world ? *'Then unto the Gentiles also hath God granted repentance unto life ;'* Acts xi. 18.

"It is evident therefore that, as compared with what is expressed by ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ch. i. 2, the virtual cleansing described here must be interpreted in a very limited sense ; and that when St. Paul spoke of the children of every believing parent as being *ipso facto* in some sense ἁγία, he spoke of them as contemplated in the mercy of Him *who calleth those things which be not, as though they were* (ch. i. 28 ; Rom. iv. 17), and in anticipation of such *faith* on the parent's part, *working by love* towards his children in the Lord, as should make both his own and their call and election sure. Consequently, no disparagement is there here to the holy and indispensable rite of Christian baptism (Mark xvi. 16) ; and could any doubt arise on the subject, the Apostle himself happily has anticipated it in ver. 16, where (as in 1 Pet. iii. 1) the baptized wife of an unbaptized husband is encouraged to hope that, in God's hand, *she* may be the means of winning him unto Christ, and so bringing him, not within the scope and the sound only, but under the gracious provisions of the covenant of salvation."—pp. 226, 227.

We should scarcely say that in this commentary, valuable as it is, there is sufficient prominence given to the argument it supplies for Infant Baptism. Without doubt, as Dr. Peile remarks, the cleansing here spoken of must be understood in a limited sense ; so also must the language of St. Peter, in Acts ii. 39, "The Promise is unto you and to your children ;" and so also must the promise to Abraham (Gen. xvii. 7), "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee." In the latter case we know that every male of that seed who was not circumcised was cut off from the people of God ; but every female was included in the covenant without any such rite, merely by birth. As Whitby here well remarks, "Else were they unclean, *i. e.* heathen children, not to be owned as a holy seed, and therefore not to be admitted into covenant with God, as belonging to His holy people. That this is the true import of the words ἀκάθαρα and ἁγία will be apparent from the Scriptures, in which the heathens are styled the 'unclean,' in opposition to the Jews in covenant with God, and therefore styled 'a holy people.'" [See Isa. xxxv. 8, 9 ; lii. 1 ; Acts x. 28 ; Neh. ii. 20 ; Isa. vi. 13 ; Ezra ix. 2.] "Therefore to this sense of the words *holy* and *unclean*

the Apostle may be here most rationally supposed to allude," &c. From whence he proceeds to argue, as the Fathers did, that since the holy seed amongst the Jews was circumcised, and thus received the sign of the covenant, so in like manner the holy seed of Christians ought to receive the laver of regeneration, or sign of the Christian covenant. Dr. Peile's annotation touches on the point, and contains much that is valuable, but does not press this argument as we should wish.

We next refer to that difficult passage, 1 Cor. vii. 36, 37. Perhaps few of our readers have ever imagined that the former of these verses is in some places actually applied by the lower classes to justify breaches of chastity before marriage. These words, "Let him do what he will, he sinneth not; let ~~them~~ marry," we have heard quoted to justify persons in living in fornication, if they afterwards marry! Dr. Peile thus comments on these two verses:—

"36. *But if any man thinks that he is acting an unbecoming (no father's) part towards his unmarried daughter, in case of her being past her prime, and if so it needs must be; let him do what he feels inclined to do—there is no sin in it—let them marry; or impersonally, let there be a marriage.* —'ἀσχημονεῖν is emphatically opposed here to τὸ εὖσχημον in the preceding verse. These my prescriptions are given for the purpose of preserving decorum; but if attention to them should in any case tend to the opposite result, then it is to be understood that they do not apply.' —Billroth."

"37. *Nevertheless, he that stands fixed in his purpose, and feels no such necessity as I have supposed (in the words καὶ οὕτως ὀφείλει γίνεσθαι, ver. 36), but feels himself perfectly free in respect of his own wish in this matter, and has come to this decision in his own mind, as to keeping his daughter unmarried, does well. So that he also that is for giving his maiden in marriage does well, but he that is against giving her in marriage does better.* 'Itaque et qui nuptum dat bene facit, et qui non dat nuptum: sed is tamen, qui non dat nuptum, melius facit.'—Schmid."

There are perhaps few texts in the sacred volume which present greater difficulties than that in Galatians iii. 19, 20, "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made, and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." It is thus interpreted by Dr. Peile:—

"19. τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; *What, then, was the object of the Law? i. e., as is plain from the words διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων δ. χ. μ., the whole Law or Economy of Moses—and so Calvin: 'Notandum est Paulum non tantum de Lege Morali loqui, sed de toto Mosis ministerio, quod*

quidem Mosis erat proprium. Id autem erat, præscribere vivendi regulam et cæremonias quibus se in Dei cultu exercerent, promissiones deinde adjungere et minas. *Quod autem multæ promissiones de gratuitâ Dei misericordiâ et de Christo inclusæ sunt illic, quæ ad fidem pertinent, hoc est quasi accidentale, quoad Legis cum doctrinâ Gratiæ comparationem.* Memineris hanc esse summam quæstionis, Cur factâ promissione demum supervenit Moses cum novâ illâ pactione, QUI FECERIT HÆC VIVET IN IPSIS: MALEDICTUS AUTEM QUI NON IMPLEVERIT OMNIA? an, ut aliquid melius et perfectius afferret?

Ibid. τῶν παραβχ. π. *Because of the multiplied transgressions of moral duty (Rom. i. 21. 32. v. 18, 14. 20) it was added to God's promises (ver. 21), as a covenant that should endure until the coming of the Seed unto which the promise is (ver. 29. Acts ii. 39), and as such under the attestation of Angels (see on Rom. ii. 27) was placed in the hand of a Mediator—i. e. first of Moses, who unto the fathers of Israel in the wilderness, and subsequently of the Mosaic Dispensation, which unto their children who went in and possessed the typical land of promise, was virtually what THE CHURCH is 'in these last days' in which 'God hath spoken to us by His Son.' The Law, as Schöttgen has shown—compare also Lev. xxvi. 46—is often said by the Rabbinical writers to have been given 'by the hand of Moses as mediator;' and a comparison of Heb. viii. 6, with Acts iii. 22—25. vii. 37, 38, may suggest a few reflections on 'the means of grace,' which by God's goodness we have now, as ancillary to 'the hope of glory' (Rom. v. 2).*

"And first, was the giving of the Law solemnly sanctioned and enforced by the attesting presence of 'the Lord with ten thousand of His Saints?' Deut. xxxiii. 2. Heb. ii. 2. It was *under the attestation also of Angels* (Acts i. 10, 11) that the men, in whose hands our Immanuel had placed the announcement of the terms of our reconciliation with Him (2 Cor. v. 19), received that 'hope of our calling of God'—'to look for His Son,' namely, as He will one day be revealed 'from Heaven'—whereby we are now distinguished, as God's covenant-people, from all who are 'aliens from the polity of Israel and strangers to the covenants of promise;' Eph. i. 18. ii. 12. Phil. iii. 20. 1 Thess. i. 10. Rom. viii. 24, 25. Again, was it through the intermediate agency and means (1) of the personal ministry of Moses, and his assistant Elders; Numb. xi. 16, 17—(2) of the distinctive Covenant of Circumcision, and of the Letter, which Moses gave them; John i. 17. vii. 19. 22. xix. 7. Rom. ii. 27. 2 Cor. iii. 6—that 'Israel after the flesh' was *kept* as God's Israel; yet *under* the grasp of *Law* (ver. 23), with but rare glimpses, under the teaching of their Prophets, either of the higher and spiritual object of their significant Ritual, or of the Grace and Truth which should come, not to destroy, but to fulfil it? It is through faith in this now disclosed 'mystery of Christ,' that *we*, in 'this grace wherein we stand' as the true and spiritual Israel, 'are kept by the power of God unto salvation, ready to be revealed in the latest among those seasons which the Father hath appointed in the exercise of His own power,' Mark xiii. 32. Acts i. 7. Rom. i. 16. 1 Pet. i. 5.

And was that servile obedience unto the letter of the commandment to continue until the manifestation of those 'sons of God,' who 'worship God in spirit, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in any thing outward in the flesh?' Rom. ii. 28. Phil. iii. 3. Even we ourselves, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit (Rom. viii. 28. James i. 18), sigh often for, what in patient perseverance we must wait for—the redemption of the mortal body which still withholds us from what is eventually to be the glory of the children of God. Was it, again, *because of the transgressions*—(1) to *restrain* them, lest haply all flesh had once more corrupted his way upon the earth; Gen. vi. 12: (2) to *make them known* and *felt* by the transgressors of Law (ch. ii. 18. Rom. ii. 27. vii. 9), and so to convict the whole world of being unquestionably guilty before God; Rom. iii. 19—that the 'holy and just and good' Law or Economy of Moses was given, as a connecting link between the Divine Promise made to Abraham, and that new and spiritual service in which it was to be realized unto them who, like him, should believe? ver. 22. It is *for our Justification*; Rom. iv. 25. v. 15. 18—(1) to set forth '*the abundance of the grace, and of the free gift of righteousness*,' which is offered to those who will accept of it on the prescribed terms of Repentance and Faith; and so (2) to further the great work of Man's final Redemption both in body and soul (Rom. viii. 23. Phil. iii. 21), by causing God's method of Justification, *designed as it is for all men*, to be *felt* and appreciated and *brought home to all*; Rom. iii. 22—that, even in our stronghold of Salvation, we still are 'prisoners of Hope' (Zech. ix. 12. Rom. viii. 24, 25. Gal. v. 5. 1 Thess. v. 8. Tit. iii. 7. James v. 7, 8. 2 Pet. iii. 14, 15); we have not yet attained the end of our faith, nor are we already perfect in love; but we have need of patience, and of using all diligence both to make our own calling and election sure, and to let our Christian light so shine before men, as that others also shall be led after our example to glorify our Father which is in Heaven."

The concluding verse of this passage is the most obscure portion of it. We have the following interpretation:—

"20. *Now a Mediator*, as the very name implies, *belongs not to one party only, and God is but one party*—we must then look for *another*, and (as we might naturally expect it to be) a yet *more highly favoured* party between whom, and the God of their fathers, Moses and the people 'baptized into Moses' should intervene. This the Apostle should have added, for the complete elucidation of his argument—and here too, like St. Peter and like St. Stephen (Acts iii. 22, 23. vii. 37), he might have noticed the express testimony which Moses had borne to Christ; and argued, as in Heb. iii. 5, 'Moses verily was faithful in all God's Household, as a servant; but Christ, as a Son, over His own Household'—but, as his manner was, he merely glances at the additional argument for a *tertium genus* to follow the Dispensation of the Law, which the mention of Moses as *a mediator* had incidentally suggested to him; and then returns, as from a digression in vv. 19, 20, to

ask: *Is it to be inferred, then, from the direct opposition in which (in ver. 18) I have set Law against Promise, that the Law is in any sense against the Promises of God? Far be it from me to assert this of two Covenants (the Patriarchal and Mosaic) which, each in its own peculiar operation and order, are like from God. I have told you what gave the Law its incidental introduction into, and purely intermediate and subservient place in, the development of 'the eternal purpose which God hath given effect unto in Christ Jesus, our Lord'—(see Eph. iii. 11, and compare note on Rom. v. 20)—and now I tell you that that great revealed mystery, whereby God may still be just, and yet forgive the sinner (Rom. iii. 21. 26), has nothing to do with the principle of Law; it was planned before the Mosaic Covenant (which was framed upon that principle) was given, and takes no account of any atoning works that on our own part we have done; Luke x. 29. xviii. 9. Tit. iii. 5. It is of the goodness only, the pure 'philanthropy of God our Saviour,' that we find ourselves released from 'all that debt,' which our conscience (inwardly 'consenting unto the Law of God, that it is good') tells us that no amount of service, that we could pay, might ever have availed to blot out as redeemed. And so, that which (as being at Law our Adversary) God has to exhibit against us, virtually in our own handwriting, yet as it were engrossed in formal codes of Law (Col. ii. 14), really makes not against, but for, the just operation of the Promise in favour of 'the man that worketh not, but believeth on Him that freely forgiveth the ungodly;' Rom. iv. 5. This it was, in fact, for which this ancillary Covenant was given—this the higher purpose of God's Providence, which it was intended and well adapted to subserve—to move men, from 'the Letter that killeth,' to flee for refuge to 'the Spirit that giveth Life.'"*

Our quotations have extended to such a length that we must now reluctantly refrain from proceeding further. We cannot but regard this Commentary as a very valuable addition to our existing works on the exegesis of Scripture. Dr. Peile is an independent thinker, and is deeply versed in the knowledge of the sacred volume, and in full possession of all the qualifications necessary to constitute him an able interpreter of the Scriptures. His diligence in collecting the opinions of preceding writers has enabled him to bring a large amount of the collected wisdom of former ages to bear on his subject. On the whole we have been much impressed by the general soundness and learning of his Commentary, and its largeness and liberality of view; and we certainly are of opinion that it deserves to occupy a place in the library of every student of the original text of Scripture, and that it will afford very material aid to all who may be enabled to consult it.

- ART. VII.—1. *A Letter to the Right Rev. William Skinner, D.D., Bishop of Aberdeen, and Primus, on the Functions of Laymen in the Church. By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. for the University of Oxford. Second Edition.* London: Murray. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. pp. 39.
2. *A Reply to the above. By the Rev. CHARLES WORDSWORTH, M.A., Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond.* London: J. H. Parker. Edinburgh: Grant and Son. pp. 63.
3. *National Christianity an Article of the Christian Faith; a Sermon preached at Kidderminster. By the Rev. CHARLES WORDSWORTH, M.A.* London: Rivingtons. pp. 35.
4. *Remarks on the above. Reprinted from the Morning Chronicle of October 22, 1851.* London: Masters. Edinburgh: R. Lendrum and Co. pp. 19.

WHENEVER the history, whether ecclesiastical or civil, of the nineteenth century shall come to be written, we apprehend that no single feature will afford greater subject for comment than the marvellous facility with which men of the highest eminence, both in religion and politics, have deliberately turned their backs upon their former opinions; have deliberately, themselves, done their best to show that the principles by which they were formerly guided were in the highest degree erroneous and unsound. From Archdeacon Manning down to Dr. Newman, on the one hand; from Sir Robert Peel down to Sir Fitzroy Kelly, on the other, we find scarcely any thing but the most palpable and avowed change of opinion, the most notorious desertion of heretofore strongly-maintained principles. Now we are not imputing this as, necessarily, a fault in the case of these persons, or of any others who have pursued a similar line of conduct. It is all very well to talk about "consistency;" to say that we must be stern and inflexible adherents to "principle;" but there is no doubt whatever that as, on the one hand, the *double-minded man* will be *unstable in all his ways, as he that wavereth will be like a wave of the sea, driven by the wind and tossed*, so, on the other hand, a blind adherence to an opinion which may formerly have been held in the most perfect sincerity and good faith, adherence simply from the fact of its having been formerly held, will very frequently, from the force of circumstances, degenerate into the very extreme of obstinate bigotry.

A man is not necessarily "inconsistent" because he changes his opinions ; but if, circumstances remaining the same, that man, of his own accord, turns his back on his former convictions, then is he justly, beyond all doubt, liable to the charge of vacillation and want of principle. To give two illustrations of our meaning. Few persons, we imagine, will be found now, after Mr. Disraeli's financial statement, who will impute "inconsistency" to the late Sir Robert Peel, with respect to the commercial policy he advocated since 1846, although, undoubtedly, such policy was a decided instance of change of opinion. Neither, we apprehend, will many be found who will call Colonel Sibthorp a "consistent" man, simply because he inflexibly maintains his former opinion with respect to the Crystal Palace and the Great Exhibition. And so our ground of complaint against such men as Archdeacon Manning and Dr. Newman, is, not simply that they have changed their views with respect to the Anglican Church—but that they have changed them, circumstances remaining precisely the same ; that they have changed them without a shadow of real reason, without a single fact having occurred which can, in the smallest degree, justify that which can, in our opinion, be justified under no circumstances whatever, viz. secession from the English Church. If they were ever really sincere in their adherence to the principles of that Church, as embodied in the Book of Common Prayer ; then, inasmuch as those principles, inasmuch as that Prayer Book, remain altogether unaltered—inasmuch as their adherence was the result, not of mere youthful, but of mature and deliberate conviction,—then are they clearly liable to the charge of the grossest inconsistency, to use no harsher term, in deserting those principles as they have deserted them. Of course we are not speaking here of their joining the Romish communion, but simply of leaving the English Church.

And so with respect to another case, of much interest at the present moment. We hold that no imputation of "inconsistency" can justly lie against any person who opposes now the grant to Maynooth, even though that person may have ever so strongly supported Sir Robert Peel's measure in 1845. Leaving out of the question all reference to the doctrines taught at Maynooth, which must be, beyond all doubt, those of the Romish Church, in their entirety, no one can deny this position—that the grant in question was intended for men who would not hold a divided allegiance—for men who would not repudiate the lawful authority of their rightful Sovereign—for men who would train up the flocks committed to their charge in habits of peaceable obedience to the law. Inasmuch, then, as it is perfectly notorious that the heads of the Romish Church in Ireland are doing pre-

cisely the reverse of all this ; inasmuch as they are openly preaching a crusade, both in Parliament and out of it, against obedience to the law, as well as against that Established Church which they so solemnly promised, in 1829, never to molest or disturb, it is surely time for English statesmen to retrace their steps on this point ; to refuse to assist Irish Romanists, in the infatuated course they now think fit to follow.

We have been led into this train of reflections by a perusal of the pamphlet which stands at the head of this paper—a pamphlet which opens up an instance, we do not say, at present, of “ inconsistency,” but certainly of change of opinion on the part of its author, as remarkable, in every respect, as any of those to which we have just referred. In our opinion, indeed, it is far more remarkable than any of these. Perhaps no man ever occupied a higher position than Mr. Gladstone at one time occupied, among English Churchmen. With a private character on which no one has ever presumed to animadvert ; eminently grave, thoughtful, religious, in his cast of mind ; a man of the highest intellectual endowments ; Mr. Gladstone was once universally regarded, except by a discerning few, as emphatically *the* champion of the English Church. His great work, “*The Relations of Church and State*,” stamped him at once as the exponent of the noblest principles in agreement alike with Scripture and antiquity, on that important subject. Such Mr. Gladstone was. We say confidently that, at the period of his election by the University of Oxford ; in 1847, a man could scarcely occupy a higher position among English Churchmen than Mr. Gladstone occupied. But how different is the case now. His strange conduct on the question of admitting Jews to Parliament, first opened the eyes of many of his former supporters. Still, though grievously shaken in their convictions, many refused to believe that their heretofore champion had altogether forsaken them. Then came the “*Papal Aggression*.” After Mr. Gladstone’s conduct on that occasion—after his remarkable speech on “*The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill*”—men could hold out no longer. Their eyes were then opened with a vengeance. They were *forced* to acknowledge, with shame and confusion of face, that they could no longer follow the standard of their former leader. But even then one thing was yet wanting ; and that, by his letter to Bishop Skinner, Mr. Gladstone has himself supplied. In that letter he has deliberately retracted every iota of his former opinions ; has deliberately unwritten nearly every word of his former greatest work ; has avowed himself the supporter of views and principles, which, if carried out in their entirety, *ought* to lead, if they are sound views, to a speedy and summary dissolution of the con-

nection between Church and State—*ought* to give, on Mr. Gladstone's own showing, the finishing stroke to the English Church as an "establishment."

Now, we are not saying, at present, that Mr. Gladstone is wrong in all this; we are not, at present, saying that he is an "inconsistent" man. He has clearly as perfect a right as any one else to change his opinions. We are merely, now, stating facts. But we have a very clear right, also, to demand, that Mr. Gladstone, of all men, shall show us some very good and sufficient grounds for such a very remarkable change. We have a fair right to demand the circumstances which have given occasion to it. And, moreover, unless those reasons will at once carry conviction with them to every unprejudiced mind—unless those circumstances are absolutely overwhelming in their nature—then will it be our painful duty, and in all sincerity we can say that no duty was ever more painful, to charge Mr. Gladstone, not only with palpable, but with wanton and reckless inconsistency; to say of him, as was said of the eldest-born of Jacob, "*unstable as water, THOU SHALT NOT PREVAIL.*"

Before, however, we proceed to our proposed inquiry, we wish to state one thing most expressly, and that is, that, in writing this paper, we have no desire, in any shape or way, to further the views of those persons who are promoting an opposition to Mr. Gladstone's return to the next Parliament for the University of Oxford. This paper was planned, and in part written, before any thing whatever was heard of the movement in question, and with that movement we are, in no way whatever, directly or indirectly, concerned. We state this plainly and distinctly. A sense of duty to the Church of England compels us to notice Mr. Gladstone's opinions on ecclesiastical questions, but we write wholly irrespective of any electioneering proceedings.

We propose to ourselves, in this paper, a twofold object. Our first and primary object will be to examine, in detail, the letter of Mr. Gladstone to Bishop Skinner, contrasting his present opinions on the "Church and State" question with those he formerly held. This we shall do by a reference partly to his great work, "*The State in its Relations with the Church,*" and partly to the very able pamphlet which that distinguished theologian, Mr. Charles Wordsworth, has issued in reply to Mr. Gladstone's Letter. But our inquiry will not end here. We purpose to allude to another "change of opinion," in its way quite as remarkable as Mr. Gladstone's. The "*Morning Chronicle,*" a journal formerly rather notorious for its Whig-radical tendencies, has, during the last two years, stood forward as the champion—save the mark!—of "Church principles;" as the organ of that

school of ecclesiastical "Liberals," whose principles, if fairly and honestly carried out, tend, we firmly believe, to the direct and speedy separation of the alliance between Church and State. It will be our object to show to the Churchmen of England what those principles really are, and whither they really, and if adopted to any considerable extent, which however we do not anticipate, inevitably tend; to show them how utterly unworthy is the journal in question to be considered as the mouth-piece of those who really love their Spiritual Mother, the Church of England. Much alarm, and much indignation, were excited by a very remarkable review in the "*Morning Chronicle*" of an admirably sound sermon, preached by Mr. Charles Wordsworth, in the course of the last autumn, at Kidderminster. The eyes of many were then partially opened; many began to be aware, for the first time, of the real views of the party who now form the principal support of the journal in which that review appeared. It will be our object to enlighten English Churchmen a little more on this subject. If they, henceforward, look on the "*Morning Chronicle*" as their special and particular organ—as their most doughty champion—it shall not be, at any rate, through any neglect of our duty; we, at all events, shall be able to say, *liberavimus animas nostras*.

Turn we then, first of all, to Mr. Gladstone. Let us see what his views formerly were on the great question of the relations which *ought* to subsist between the Church and the State. Let us see what opinions were formerly held by one who now stands prominently forward as the advocate of "religious liberty"—as the champion of what the "*Morning Chronicle*" calls the "*political EQUALITY of all religions.*"

We must, however, guard ourselves, at the outset, from being misunderstood in one very important particular. We do not, for a moment, intend to charge Mr. Gladstone and many of his followers with any deliberate *wish* to dissolve the alliance between Church and State. Far from it. But we do most firmly believe that the *principles* Mr. Gladstone now advocates do tend, directly, towards such a consummation. We believe, moreover, that if those principles are sound, then is that alliance a gross and palpable injustice, and this we will prove in detail presently. We do most firmly believe that, upon their own principles, it is the bounden duty of the new supporters of "religious liberty" to fraternize, heart and soul, with that most erudite and philosophical body, the "Anti-State-Church Association." On their own showing, Mr. Gladstone and D. C. L. *ought*, on this particular question, to unite with Mr. Miall and Dr. Binney, for the destruction of that "monster grievance," the Anglican "establishment."

Mr. Gladstone commences his work, on "The State in its Relations with the Church," with a sentence, which under present circumstances, is pregnant with fearful meaning.

"Probably," he says, we quote from the third edition, "there never was a time in the history of our country, when the connection between the Church and the State was threatened from quarters so manifold and various as at present¹."

The enemies of "the connection" whom he enumerates, were, *at that time*, the infidel, the Romanist, the professor of political economy, and the democrat. Whenever Mr. Gladstone publishes another edition of this work, we trust that he will not forget to add to this list, that school of "liberal" Churchmen, which he himself has recently joined.

But hear now, how eloquently and forcibly Mr. Gladstone advocates the justice, and to the well-being of the State, the *absolute necessity* of maintaining the alliance:—

"If, therefore, we believe that the connection of Church and State, rescued on the one hand from Papal, and on the other from Erastian, tyranny of either power over its ally, be conformable to the will of God, essential to the permanent well-being of a community, implied and necessitated by every right idea of civil government, and calculated to extend and establish the vital influences of Christianity, and therewith to increase and purify the mass of individual happiness; then, as holders of that belief, are we all the most imperatively summoned to its defence in this the most critical period of its history²."

And again:—

"But the State, in rejecting her, would actively violate its most solemn duty, and would, if the theory of the connection be sound, *entail upon itself a curse*. We know of no effectual preservative principle except religion; nor of any permanent, secure, and authenticated religion but in the Church. The State, then, if she allows false opinions to overrun and bewilder her, and, under their influence, separates from the Church, will be guilty of an obstinate refusal of truth and light, which is the heaviest sin of man. It is of more importance, therefore, for our interests as a nation, that we should sift this matter to the bottom, than for our interests as a Church. Besides all which, it may be shown that the principles, upon which alone the connection can be disavowed, tend intrinsically and directly to disorganization, inasmuch as they place government itself upon a false foundation³."

Again, speaking of the respective theories of Hooker and Paley, he says:—

"None of these writers regarded the subject in the aspect most

¹ P. 1.

² P. 3.

³ P. 4.

imperatively required by present circumstances: namely, that which shows that governments are, by 'dutiful necessity,' cognizant of religious truth and falsehood, and bound to the maintenance and propagation of the former⁴."

He recognizes to the fullest extent,—

"The great doctrine that the State is a person, having a conscience, cognizant of matter of religion, and bound by all constitutional and natural means to advance it⁵."

Again, in objecting to Warburton's theory, Mr. Gladstone has this striking remark:—

"The State is to contract with the largest religious society. The adoption of a national Church is then with it matter of calculation, and not of conscience. The state in this view has no conscience. It is not contemplated in the bishop's work as a moral person, having responsibility before God, nor as an aggregation of individuals, each having personal responsibilities, and bound in all things according to their capability to serve God, His Church, His truth: therefore under obligation to regard that service as in itself an end of positive value, independently of the resulting benefits to the State⁶."

Now, perhaps, we cannot better show how completely Mr. Gladstone has changed his views on this point, than by giving an extract from a *leading article* of that champion of Church principles, the "Morning Chronicle," written by way of answer to Mr. Charles Wordsworth. Mr. Wordsworth, very naturally, objected to Mr. Gladstone's present theory, that he formerly regarded the State "as a person," having "a conscience." What says the organ of "religious liberty" to this?

"After all, the question for us as Churchmen, is not about *the future of the State*, but about the palpable present of the Church. Indeed, we are reduced to this dilemma, either the State makes a definite profession of religion, or it does not. If it does not, so Mr. Wordsworth puts it" (observe, not *now* Mr. Gladstone, but Mr. Wordsworth), "the State, as such, being apostate, is only reserved for the wrath of God, *a position which, being a theological one, we are precluded from entering into*'. If it does, then the present aspect of our own Church shows what comes of such a profession; for Mr. Wordsworth appears to hold, that the original relations of our Church and State were perfect. Is it not possible, however, *to leave the question of the States' APOSTASY OR CHRISTIANITY open*, and to do what we can for vindicating the Church's liberty⁷?"

⁴ P. 6.

⁵ P. 9.

⁶ P. 13.

⁷ The italics are ours.

⁸ Morning Chronicle, April 2.

Now this, at all events, is plain speaking, and we heartily thank the "Chronicle" for it. Here, Churchmen of England, are two admissions. First, that that journal, which professes to be your peculiar organ is, as such, "precluded from entering into a purely theological question;" and, secondly, that whether the State of England be, or be not, "apostate or Christian," is a question of no importance whatever to English Churchmen. *They*, as such, have only to look to the "liberty of the Church," leaving the State to its own devices, free to embrace any religion, or no religion, just as it thinks fit. English Churchmen are to sit perfectly still, to allow the State, without any opposition, or remonstrance, to fraternize with the Archbishop of Canterbury or Mr. Baptist Noel, with Cardinal Wiseman or Joe Smith, with Dr. Newman or his infidel brother, as shall seem best in its own eyes; not, by the way, in its own conscience, because that is an article, which it is clearly very much better it should be altogether without!

But we are sorry to say, that the "Morning Chronicle" is not the only journal which has thought it becoming its position, as, in this case, a recognized organ of the Church party, to defend Mr. Gladstone against Mr. Wordsworth. How far the position of the "Guardian," at present, is in accordance with the understanding on which it was established, is a point on which our readers may form their own opinions, after reading the following extract from a "leading article" of May 12, headed "Religious Liberty." We call the special attention of our readers to this extract, for three reasons. First, because it so clearly establishes the "change of opinion" on Mr. Gladstone's part; secondly, because they will be able to judge from it how far the "Guardian" is a safe guide on ecclesiastical subjects; and, thirdly, for another reason, which we will give them presently. The "Guardian" thus speaks of Mr. Wordsworth's reply to Mr. Gladstone.

"Its most successful passages are those in which passages of Mr. Gladstone's earlier and later writings are brought into sharp contrast and shown, truly enough, to be totally irreconcilable. If any one really needed to be informed that Mr. Gladstone had *changed his mind*, this was worth doing; nor, indeed, is it any one's business to defend Mr. Gladstone from the ordinary penalty of *a complete alteration of recorded opinions*. We may concede, without reserve, to Mr. Wordsworth, that having written strongly in favour of a State conscience and of the maintenance of a particular form of religion by the civil power, he is now to be found writing as decidedly, and certainly with no loss of power, on that of 'religious liberty.'

"We cannot, however, concede to Mr. Wordsworth, that this is a disastrous change, nor assent to his statement of the scriptural obliga-

tion and social justice of the old exclusive system. Mr. Gladstone maintains in general that 'religious liberty' is not only becoming a political necessity, but is, under the circumstances of the time, a thing to be cordially accepted for the sake of religious peace, common justice, and the maintenance of Divine Truth itself. Mr. Wordsworth does not see this; he refuses to see it, and shuts his eyes to what we must be permitted to call an obvious truth with all his might. He quotes Hesiod and Euripides, to show that nations are visited for the sins of individuals, and, therefore, for their schisms and errors of belief, unless the State discourages them. He asserts again and again that Scripture expressly directs the civil power, *as such*, to maintain religious doctrine, and interfere in religious controversy. He assumes that what is true of an individual, is true of the State; and that, as individuals are told to 'mark them which cause divisions,' 'not to bid them God speed,' 'not to receive them into their houses,' and the like, the State is therefore bound to act in an analogous way to large classes of its subjects."

Now the language of the first part of this extract is so plain and precise, that it really relieves us from any necessity whatever of illustrating the change in Mr. Gladstone, by any further reference to his former treatise. But we wish to point out in reference to it, a very singular proceeding on the part of the "Guardian," and one for which we cannot account. Will our readers believe that, after this most candid, and, to all appearance, ingenuous avowal of change of opinion in Mr. Gladstone, on a subject so important, as to demand a special "leader" in the "Guardian" respecting it; *the very next week after this*, another "leading article" appeared in this very same paper, an article of nearly two columns in length, utterly and entirely, and emphatically denying the existence of any change of opinion whatever on the part of Mr. Gladstone, since his election in 1847! That we may not do the "Guardian" a shadow of injustice, we will give extracts from the article in question, simply premising that, between May 12 and May 19, a declaration had appeared, signed extensively by Members of Convocation, deprecating Mr. Gladstone's re-election for the University of Oxford. In a "leader" headed "Oxford and Mr. Gladstone," of May 19, the following passages occur:—

"Has Mr. Gladstone, in a word, or has he not, departed from the principles which were substantially asserted by his election in 1847, and on the strength of which he was in fact elected? If he has, opposition is justifiable; if not, it is, according to University precedent, not so. Now we apprehend there can be but one answer to the question thus raised. **WHAT MR. GLADSTONE WAS IN 1847, THAT IS HE NOW.**"

Again:—

"It" [i.e. Mr. Gladstone's theory] "is a principle from which, of

course, many persons dissent; but such persons dissented from it also in 1847, and they opposed Mr. Gladstone accordingly. But those who thus opposed then can hardly come forward now, and on the strength of this their old ground of opposition, complain that Mr. Gladstone has changed and has broken faith with them. The truth is, their quarrel with him is not that he has changed, *but that he has not changed*—not that he is a different man, *but that he is so thoroughly the same*. He was sent to parliament to uphold this very principle, among others, and he has upheld it accordingly. That is his crime. . . .

"But the essential point is, that the principles on which Mr. Gladstone has acted are those on which he was elected. The question is, have any principles or conditions on the strength of which Mr. Gladstone was elected, been abandoned or violated by him in his subsequent career? We think not. We think that even his opponents tacitly confess that he is substantially and essentially the same now as he was at the time of his election. The real reason why there will be an opposition to him, if opposition there is, will be because he is a Churchman."

Now, a more palpable instance, not simply of *suppressio veri*, but of *suggestio falsi* also, it was never our fortune to meet with, than is contained in the extracts we have here given. First, as to the *suggestio falsi*. It is asserted, *on the 19th May*, that Mr. Gladstone is not one whit changed since 1847. That such as he was then, "that is he now." Then why, on the *12th May*, did the "Guardian" devote one of its columns to an elaborate attempt—not to contradict Mr. Charles Wordsworth's charge of direct retrogression, of open and avowed tergiversation, on Mr. Gladstone's part, with respect to the question of "religious liberty"—but, after openly, frankly, and fully admitting the change of opinion, to justify Mr. Gladstone in making it? Let the "Guardian" of May 12th say, whether the statement of the "Guardian" of May 19th, that, such as Mr. Gladstone was in 1847, "that is he now," be a true or a false statement.

But now for the *suppressio veri*, and let our readers mark this, for it is very important. In this article the "Guardian" argues as if the only persons who have a right to object, and actually do object, to Mr. Gladstone's conduct, are the identical parties who opposed him and supported Mr. Round in 1847. Such parties "cannot complain that Mr. Gladstone has broken faith *with them*." *With them*, forsooth! Why, doubtless, this is true, as far as it goes, but are there none who *can* complain, and who *do* complain, most bitterly, that "*with them*" Mr. Gladstone has "broken faith?" Does not the "Guardian" know perfectly well, that the largest and most influential section of the Church party will not oppose Mr. Gladstone themselves, and would, for various reasons, deprecate opposition to his return; but yet, if an opposi-

tion does arise, will not be able conscientiously to support him, and therefore will remain neutral, just because they consider that "with them" that gentleman has "broken faith?" The "Guardian" knew this perfectly well, and therefore was guilty of a *suppressio veri* in omitting to state it. For mark the possible importance of the omission. We know perfectly well that it is the fashion, now a days, to make a great use of newspapers. Many men take their opinions from them altogether, partly from inability to read for themselves, and partly from sheer indolence. On the other hand, some persons—it really is so—scarcely ever see a newspaper at all, and this is especially the case with country clergymen. Now see the unfair use which might be made of this article. A country Member of Convocation, never having heard of Mr. Gladstone's Letter to Bishop Skinner, and of Mr. Wordsworth's reply to it—we are stating no impossible contingency—finds, by a circular from Mr. Gladstone's committee, that an opposition is springing up for the University. Well, he will naturally say, "But what has Mr. Gladstone done? Why should they oppose him?" What will be the reply? "Oh, Mr. Gladstone has done nothing. He is not a bit changed. This is only the old 'Low Church' objection over again. There is the 'Guardian,' that, in 1847, acknowledged and recognized organ of Mr. Gladstone's supporters—that consistent and staunch upholder of sound Anglican principles—told its readers the other day that Mr. Gladstone is not an atom changed in opinion—that he is only objected to 'because he is a Churchman'—that such as he was in 1847, 'that is he now.'" And so the innocent man, *knowing nothing about the leading article of May 12th*, promises to vote for Mr. Gladstone, when, if he knew his real views on "religious liberty," he would as soon promise to vote for Mr. Miall!

We will give two more extracts from Mr. Gladstone, before we proceed to discuss the tenor of his Letter to Bishop Skinner. We declare that, in quoting the first passage, we well-nigh tremble as we write, to think that such a man should have done his best to reduce to a "dead letter" language and principles of so solemn and important a nature. Thank God, though *he* may change, the eternal truth of his former principles will outlive all the sophistical arguments and all the "liberal" theories which he can now bring against them. Still it must be no less a subject of deep and lasting regret, that the hand which created should be among the foremost in the endeavour to destroy. Hear how eloquently Mr. Gladstone once described the atheistical result of religious indifference, on the part of the State; the issue, the cer-

tain issue, of his new theory of "religious liberty," if that theory be carried out to its full extent:—

"This divorce," he says, "of religion from government will proceed upon the principle that men of all religions, or none, are alike to be considered competent for the duties of citizenship. If, however, a man is competent for public, is he not also competent for private duties? If without religion we can learn and discharge our duties to our country and our laws and authorities, can we not also without religion learn our duties to our parents, brethren, families, friends, where we are aided, by natural instincts, and where the return, in the shape of enjoyment, is more certain, immediate, and abundant, as well as the corresponding penalty of failure to perform them? In this view the argument, which is good to prove that religious differences have no bearing upon the discharge of political duties, is equally good to prove, that they have no bearing on private life, and, consequently, asserts the possibility and propriety of a social system founded on atheism, in its real and substantial sense of the denial of a providential government of the world. Is not this assertion, conveyed through the most authentic organs which are at human command, an issue awful to contemplate? Let him who is tempted to acquiesce in the doctrine which thus disconnects belief and conduct, remember the precept of St. Paul, 'Speak every man truth with his neighbour, *for we are members one of another.*' He could scarcely think that relative duties were independent of religious creed, who thus expressly grounded them on the high Christian doctrine of union in the *body* of the Redeemer⁹."

Just contrast with this the following extract from the "Morning Chronicle" review of Mr. Wordsworth's Sermon at Kidderminster. Sad, indeed, is the reflection that the *present* difference between these two writers should be so fearfully narrowed in extent.

"Slowly," says the reviewer, "have men who believe in the essential unity and the divine contexture of the Christian Church realized to themselves the truth, that to civil government, *as such*, viz. as the expression of national police, the gift of discernment of the truth was vouchsafed in no higher degree than to individuals; and that, therefore, to attempt to attach to it the everlasting indefeasible protection of religion, is to abandon the divinely-guaranteed liberty of the Christian Church, framed and incorporated by Christ Himself, for a human protection, which might at times be salutary, and might at other times be equally prejudicial. Unhappily, some of those who felt this side of the truth the most keenly were very blind as to the other one, and assumed an interference on the part of the Christian Church with the temporali-

⁹ The State, &c. pp. 304, 305.

ties of sovereignty, as destructive of the primitive idea of equity as the evil it was set up to counteract¹."

The other passage we shall quote has relation to another view of the subject. It was a commonly received opinion among old-fashioned and ignorant people, that certain glorious prophecies of Holy Scripture had a direct reference to the triumphs of the Christian Church. So, at all events, Mr. Gladstone once thought, and, so thinking, he thus beautifully expressed his opinion:—

"Surely," he says, "it must touch the heart, when, after having looked upon these awful prospects, which appear palpably to lie at least before some nations of the world, we turn to the blessed Scriptures and observe the strong yearnings of affection wherewith the world's great King wrought for our deliverance, and the exultation with which His prophets and His saints foretold a friendship between earthly thrones and His spiritual body, and a consecration of earthly powers to His glory, which has appeared already, so far as to identify the description, but of which it seems as though the obstinacy of human madness would yet struggle to intercept the glorious fulfilment,—‘He shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth. The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall bring presents: the kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea all kings shall fall down before Him: all nations shall serve Him. His name shall endure for ever: His name shall be continued as long as the sun; and men shall be blessed in Him; all nations shall call Him blessed.’ ‘And kings shall be thy nursing fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers: they shall bow down to thee with their face towards the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet.’ ‘And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it².’"

But now, in these enlightened days, *nous avons changé tout cela*. The "Morning Chronicle" thinks differently—do Mr. Gladstone and the reviewer agree here?—and the "Morning Chronicle" is the avowed organ of certain English Churchmen! We give our readers the quotation, abstaining from all comment:—

"The world has been very long in coming to this common-sense view. But we are not astonished at it. The sight of the mighty men of the earth bowing to the Cross was most seductive. The adulation paid to them for it was equally seductive to them, and thus Erastianism was, at various epochs of Church history, shrouded in the *quasi* religious garb of the ascription to all sovereigns of those peculiar titles and prerogatives especially allotted in Holy Scripture to the monarchs of the chosen people, who were particularly and supernaturally raised up in the direct line of the coming Messiah³."

¹ Remarks, &c. p. 7.

² The State, &c. pp. 308, 309.

³ Remarks, &c. p. 5.

And now, then, let us see what is Mr. Gladstone's present view of the relations which ought to subsist between the Church and State, as developed in his letter to Bishop Skinner, "On the Functions of Laymen in the Church." It affords us great pleasure to be able, on two points mentioned in that letter, to agree most cordially with the writer. We fully sympathize in the remarks he has made respecting ritual observances and religious ceremonials. We firmly believe that, if men had acted up to the spirit which actuates these remarks, very much of the turmoil, and strife, and bickering of the last ten years, would have been altogether avoided.

"I shall venture two remarks," says Mr. Gladstone, "upon ritual changes generally, in which I am bold enough to anticipate extensive agreement. The first is, that as ceremonial is but the dress of devotion, it ought to follow upon rather than to precede spiritual growth, of which it must be the consequence before it can become the cause; and, except as to the removal of palpable indecency and scandal, it should be left for its increase to such spontaneous demand as may arise out of our gradual return to that temper of elevated and concentrated devotion, which has unhappily become rare among us. The second is, that many of the points, which have given rise to dissension, are in themselves really but secondary, and have derived their importance from prepossessions conventionally rather than essentially connected with them. Now both of these remarks point to one and the same conclusion; namely, that diversities and changes of ritual, so far as they are properly open questions at all, are a matter to which the people ought to have something to say. If ceremonial be in general not so much a means of awakening as an instrument of edification for those already awakened, then the expediency of ritual restorations must, it is evident, vary greatly with the religious temper of each congregation. If, again, its details are as it were prejudged by prepossessions for or against them, then manifestly there is a tender and irritable state of mind to deal with, which will become hopeless under any thing like an exasperating treatment. The way to conquer men's prejudices is to appeal freely to their good sense, and allow some reasonable scope to their free will and choice. Such appeal involves, or at the very least harmonizes with, the idea of giving them a share of discretion in determining the points at issue. Nothing can be more painful or disgraceful than to see questions of divine service settled, as they were some years ago settled in Exeter, by riot and uproar. Such modes of proceeding are fitter for Turkey than for England. But we probably never should have witnessed them, had it not been for the anarchical state into which congregational organization has there been allowed to lapse. Besides the things in themselves, nay, besides the prejudices attaching to them, there was, I believe, at the root of all, a sentiment in the people that they were over-ridden, which generated, as it were in self-defence, a strong and

unmanageable reaction. Had there been in those cases a regularly constituted congregation, or to borrow a phrase from our Presbyterian friends, a roll of communicants, and had these had the means of making known their sentiments, and of acting by their duly chosen officers, the clergy would have derived from them the most valuable aid at the outset, instead of being left to work out their way as it were blindfold; a general harmony would have been secured between the forms of divine service and the tone of feeling in the congregations, to which, as we have seen, they ought to bear a close regard; and authority, too weak already, would have been spared some heavy blows.

"It would be transgressing my proper sphere were I, in touching on this question, to point out particulars which might advantageously be left to vary with the will of each pastor and congregation, or in which usage of a certain duration should be held to give a title as against written laws until the pastor and the congregation jointly were prepared and desirous to reform it. I assume of course all along, that the leading principles and usages of the ritual will remain fixed, as at present, by canon; and that the Episcopal authority will still hold its place above merely local discretion. My suggestion is, that over and above all this the clergy may most advantageously take counsel with their people, as members of a Christian Church, according to the principles of a sound ecclesiastical constitution, on matters like these; and that such counsel, and its results, will be found an admirable specific for the practical solution of the question, when it arises, between custom and written law, or between allowable varieties of taste and predilection, subject always to the general principle of uniformity within the limits determined by our Church law⁴."

We have much pleasure, also, in showing how completely Mr. Gladstone differs from a certain school of divines, who are desirous of introducing the systematic practice of "auricular confession," as the rule of life, into the Church of England. Mr. Gladstone thus speaks on this point:—

"I understand the Reformation, such as you receive it, to have re-established a most important ethical and social principle, in throwing upon each individual Christian the weighty responsibility of being, except in the case of open and palpable offences of whatever kind, his own spiritual director, and himself the sole judge of his own need for help in that kind⁵."

But here, we are sorry to say, our agreement with the distinguished writer of the letter to Bishop Skinner must, perforce, end. We entreat our readers carefully to bear in mind the principles which pervade the extracts we have already given from

⁴ Letter to Bishop Skinner, &c. pp. 31—33.

⁵ Ibid. p. 18.

Mr. Gladstone's former work, and the very solemn sanctions on which those principles were based. By so doing, they will better appreciate the unhappy spirit by which the letter we have now to consider is, throughout, pervaded.

"The time has been," says the writer, "when, as I think, it was the duty of a good citizen to look with utter aversion on whatever seemed to impair strictness of religious character and profession in the State. With that religious character, consistently and rigidly maintained, it is hard, as we must admit, to reconcile full liberty of conscience; but in maintaining it, for the times of which I speak, the greater good was preserved, and the lesser sacrificed. It is not so now. It is now so utter an impossibility to uphold a consistent religious profession in the State, that we must be satisfied with an inconsistent one, and thankful if it do not shock the common reason and sense of justice planted in mankind, by affecting a bastard and deceptive consistency. I am jealous of all attempts at consistency in this matter, most of all because I am convinced that they would and must result in the greatest of civil calamities—the mutilation, under the seal of civil authority, of the Christian religion itself. The garment will not fit the wearer; and if it is to be put on, as his figure cannot change to suit it, it therefore must change to suit him; must stretch here, and draggle there, and tear every where. If such would be the necessary result of aiming at consistency, we may well be content to forego the effort for attaining it. But then this inconsistency of profession, being radical and systematic, palpably and greatly alters the qualifications and authority of the State in respect to religion, and reduces it more and more to the character, although *circa sacra*, of a temporal agency and influence⁶."

Now, obviously, the first question which would suggest itself to the mind of every reader of this passage would be, "What are the reasons for this change of opinion on the part of such a man as Mr. Gladstone? *Why* is it that the principles he so forcibly maintained heretofore, are now altogether abandoned? *Why* is it that the duty of the 'State,' in 1852, is so diametrically opposed to that which was, in Mr. Gladstone's opinion, its positive and bounden duty, under pain of God's heaviest displeasure, when the last edition of his former work was issued?" Strange to say, Mr. Gladstone takes the propriety of this change for granted. He really gives no reason whatever for it. Mr. Wordsworth has very admirably enlarged on the magnitude of the question here involved. Our readers, we are sure, will thank us for giving them, as we propose to do, copious extracts from this,—*pace* the "Morning Chronicle" and the "Guardian,"—most eloquent,

⁶ Letter to Bishop Skinner, &c. p. 9.

sound, and dignified answer to the startling statements of the Member for the University of Oxford.

"In the first of these passages," says Mr. Wordsworth, "you seem to state, that the *time has come* when certain politico-religious truths, previously received and maintained by the great and good of all ages, have changed their nature, if not in themselves, yet for us. You seem to intimate that something has taken place—you do not mention what—which renders it undesirable, nay, impossible for us, as a nation, to aim any longer at consistency in our Christian profession—an aim, which was not only, as you admit, attended by great (if not unalloyed) benefits; but also prescribed (as you formerly maintained) by the written Word of God: and you are satisfied to forego all such attempts for the future,—in other words, to accept our present inconsistency as 'radical and systematic,' a *fait accompli* from which we cannot turn either to the right hand or to the left—because you assume that the attempts, if made, could not fail to 'result in the mutilation, under the seal of civil authority, of the Christian religion itself.' Proceeding upon this assumption,—I will not now stop to say how unwarranted,—you very naturally endeavour to persuade us to make the best of our necessity; you point out to us that under it we must be prepared to give and take; to enter into a sort of mutual Insurance Company with all sects and denominations for the maintenance of Religious Indifference, on the part of the State—and, on the part of individuals, of what you dignify by the name of 'Religious Freedom'."

It may, however, be well to devote a brief space to a consideration of the reasons which are assigned, by certain parties, for the opinion that the former *status* of the relations between the State and the Church can no longer be maintained, with a due regard alike to the claims of the Church as a divine institution, and to the maintenance of Christian doctrine unimpaired. We apprehend that two special reasons are commonly assigned for this opinion, the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford, and the "Gorham Judgment." Now, our readers will not suspect us of under-rating the importance of these questions, even though we decline to recognize them as reasons sufficiently weighty to justify so sweeping and radical a change as Mr. Gladstone assumes to be a thing of course. Let us consider them in detail. We apprehend that the turning point of the Hampden question was the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench, as to the liberty, on the part of Churchmen, of objecting, if necessary, to an episcopal appointment. No one, we apprehend, will say that, if the decision of the judges had been different, the liberty of the Church might not have been fully maintained.

⁷ Letter to Mr. Gladstone, pp. 7, 8.

Now, if so, we maintain confidently, that that decision, being so plainly an unjust decision on the part of Lord Denman; being so directly in defiance of the acknowledged principles of Westminster Hall; being so palpably and avowedly based upon grounds which had nothing whatever to do with the real merits of the case, ought not to weigh as a single feather in the scale, with respect to the question we are now considering. Of course, when we speak of injustice, on the part of Lord Denman, we allude, not to his Lordship's own particular "judgment," which was, doubtless, a conscientious one, but simply to his refusal to allow the "rule to go," when the opinions of the four judges were equally divided. We very well remember what an eminent Queen's Counsel said to us, at the time, on that particular point—one, moreover, who would not have cared an atom for the appointment of twenty Dr. Hampdens. His remark to ourselves was, that "Westminster Hall was ringing" with the injustice of the eminent person in question, in refusing to allow the acknowledged principle to prevail, that, when judges were equally divided in opinion, a rule is always "made absolute." Now, surely, no argument ought to be drawn from a decision, delivered under these circumstances, in favour of such a theory as Mr. Gladstone now advocates.

And so, with respect to the "judgment," in the Gorham case, there are, as it seems to us, two reasons for taking the same ground. In the first place, the "judgment" itself is so generally disregarded, *on its merits*, that we ought to attach no importance whatever to it, *as a precedent*, any more than the men of that day did to the decision of the judges in Sir Edward Hale's case, with respect to the right of James II. to exercise the "dispensing power."

But, moreover, we submit, that if the "Gorham judgment" be considered of sufficient importance to drag such weighty consequences along with it, then, in any case, we are entitled to plead *against Mr. Gladstone* the "statute of limitation." He ought to have evolved his theory just as much in 1847, as at the present time. We are speaking now, not as to the merits of the judgment itself, but as to *the particular tribunal by which that "judgment" was delivered*. We submit to our readers that, if the fact of the "Judicial Committee," being the "final court of appeal," be, as is said, a valid and sufficient reason for upsetting the existing relations between the Church and the State, at all events, Mr. Gladstone, having for a long series of years acquiesced, at least outwardly, in that tribunal, cannot *now* hang such weighty and fearful consequences on the mere fact of its existence. The injustice, whatever it was, was committed when

the "final appeal" was transferred from the "Court of Delegates" to the "Judicial Committee." The grievance was as real and direct during, certainly, the issuing of the later editions of Mr. Gladstone's great work, as it is now, but not a greater grievance, not a grievance sufficiently *new* to justify Mr. Gladstone's radical change of opinion. Alter that tribunal as soon as possible, but do not ground upon it *now*, a course of action which you have *not* grounded upon it during the number of years it has hitherto existed. Take a somewhat parallel case. Suppose a minister of the crown to introduce a statute which really involves the most palpable injustice; which directly interferes with the "liberty of the subject," but the injustice of which is not prominently conspicuous, till, some twenty years after it has become law, *it is put into practical operation*. Obviously, the primary interference with the liberty of the subject took place at the passing of the statute; yet surely no one would dream, let the outcry against the statute itself and its consequences be ever so great, of moving the impeachment of the minister by whom that statute was brought in, *whatever efforts might be made for the repeal of the statute itself*. Lapse of time would bar the impeachment. So we say here, that lapse of time ought to bar any disruption of the relations between the Church and the State, however great the grievance may be which the Church sustains from the "Judicial Committee," so far, at any rate, as Mr. Gladstone is concerned.

And again, it is a favourite argument with Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Hope, and others of the same school of "Church Liberals," that the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill" interfered with "full and free toleration." Very well; but why, then, did not these gentlemen say so in, and since 1829? It is matter of history that the "Emancipation Act" contained quite as stringent a provision against the recent "aggression" of the Bishop of Rome, as the act of 1851 contains; and, therefore, unless they will have recourse to the wretched sophistry of Mr. Bowyer, with respect to the "existing sees," they have actually been themselves parties, for twenty-two years, to the disallowal of "full and free toleration." They ought, in common honesty, instead of taking their present course, to have long ago moved, if they dared, to sweep away that clause, which Romanists were then only too glad to accept, from the act of 1829. By not having done so they have "estopped" themselves from the cuckoo-cry, on that question, of "religious liberty." Just so, we say, with respect to the Judicial Committee. Reform that tribunal as soon as possible; and, thanks to the Bishop of London, the opportunity of pressing

for its reform will soon occur. Strike out of it every man not a *bonâ fide* member of the Church of England. See to it, that the episcopal bench has a proper share in its deliberations ; but, in the name of common sense, do not talk about a grievance, be it ever so great—and in this case it is very great indeed—which has existed for a number of years past, being *now* a sufficient reason for upsetting altogether the existing relations between the Church and the State. We want some *new* circumstances to justify a change of opinion, not a mere enumeration of long standing grievances. Our readers will not misunderstand us. We are not now discussing the abstract merits or demerits of the "Judicial Committee of the Privy Council," as the Church's "final court of appeal." All we say is, that *Mr. Gladstone* cannot fairly plead that committee as in any wise a reason for his radical change of opinion on the question of "religious liberty," inasmuch as the grievance, whatever it be, resulting from that committee, was as great in 1847 as it is now. The actual delivery of the Gorham judgment makes no difference whatever, in this view of the case, except that it makes the grievance more manifest. That judgment was but the regular development of a long-established tribunal, and our business, as Churchmen, is to see to it, that, if a final appeal in matters of faith be to "lie to the crown," at all events, the crown shall, as Archbishop Bramhall properly said, judge that appeal "by fit delegates."

But it is time that we return more especially to *Mr. Gladstone*. He thus further develops his theory of "religious liberty :"—

"Against all such encroachments I for one will steadily set my face, and will labour to the uttermost, whether it be ostensibly on our own behalf or on behalf of others, whether for the sake of common justice, or of religious peace, or of Divine truth itself, to assert the principle, vital to us all, of a full religious freedom. That principle, I contend, when the State has ceased to bear a definite and full religious character, it is no less our interest than our duty to maintain. Away with the servile doctrine, that religion cannot live but by the aid of Parliaments. That aid is a greater or a lesser good, according to circumstances ; but conditions are also supposable, under which it would be a great evil. The security of religion lies first in the Providence of God and the promise of Christ : next in the religious character, and strong sentiment of personal duty and responsibility, so deeply graven on this country and its people. But if that character and sentiment be the mainstay of our reliance here on earth, our first duty must be to see that full scope is given to it ; that the development of conscientious convictions, in whatever quarter, is not artificially impeded by legislative meddling ; that however wary and patient we may be as to any question of moving forwards, above all we be careful not to move backwards, nor for one

moment acquiesce in any kind of tampering with the existing liberty of conscience in the persons either of ourselves or of others⁸."

Now, we can scarcely comment on the above passage without, in some sort, going over again our former ground. We cannot, however, forbear from asking Mr. Gladstone in what respect the "religious character of the State" is less "definite" and less "full," at the present time, than it was in 1847? In 1847, the "Test Act" had long been repealed. In 1847, Romish and Protestant dissenters had, for years past, been admitted into the House of Commons. We know of no change, since that time, which has any bearing whatever upon the question of "religious liberty." Doubtless, by his advocacy of the admission of Jews into the legislature, Mr. Gladstone has himself done all he possibly can do to *make* the "religious profession of the State" less "definite" and less "full;" but he is scarcely entitled yet, at all events, to raise any argument, on that ground, with respect to "religious liberty." But more than this. Miserably as the "religious character of the State" is, even now, lowered and deteriorated, still we maintain that it is, at the present time, actually more "definite" and more "full" than in 1847, from the passing of the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill." However short that bill fell of the position it ought to have taken; however infinitesimally small the gratitude we, as Churchmen, owe to its author, still that bill was, as far as it went, a practical recognition of the rights of the Anglican Church, and therefore, so far, "the religious character of the State" is really more "definite" and more "full" than it was before that bill was passed; than it was *before* Mr. Gladstone changed his opinions.

Nor, however much we may lament the shortcomings of that "religious character," must we be, therefore, insensible to the profession of religion which the State *does* make, even now? Mr. Wordsworth has put this point very forcibly in his sermon at Kidderminster. He shows, plainly enough, that we have yet very much of good remaining; that very many of our old landmarks must be swept away before Mr. Gladstone's new theory of "religious liberty" can come into full operation.

"If," he says, "the 'kingdoms of the world' are to become, as Scripture teaches, 'the kingdom of Christ,' they must be governed upon Christian principles. In ordinary cases, they have no commission to inflict punishment for religious error, merely as such, but they have a commission to withhold privileges. Otherwise, they become Anti-christians. Wisely and piously, therefore, does the constitution of our State, in the *full toleration* which it allows to schism and unbelief,

⁸ Letter to Bishop Skinner, pp. 10, 11.

exhibit at the same time a graduated scale of *encouragement and preference* for the truth, proportioned to the dignity and importance of the several places of trust and authority, which, as the depository of Christ's power, it is commissioned to bestow. Thus it has reserved its utmost watchfulness, its keenest and most jealous eye, wherewith to guard and secure the highest place; the seat which is occupied by the representative of Christ Himself; the fountain-head, from which all honour flows. The sovereign whom it admits into the throne is bound to be not only a Christian, but a Catholic Christian; not only a Catholic Christian, but a Protestant; as designed to represent and uphold the truth of the Gospel, not only against the unbelief of the Jew, but the false doctrine of the heretic; not only against the false doctrine of the heretic, but the schism and usurpation of the See of Rome. The same restrictions apply to a *Regent*, and to the highest offices of the law. In the two Houses of Parliament it is less exclusive. It admits all upon 'the true faith of a Christian,'—with the demand of an additional pledge from the Romanist, whom it has greater reason to suspect; and this it does, not as indifferent to the religious errors of any who either dissent or oppose themselves to the truth; but as confiding in the honour of all, and as trusting to conciliate and win them to the unity of the Body of Christ, where they have been made participators of His power. From the constituency, where there is less immediate danger in the exercise of the trust, it does not exclude even the unbeliever. If there be fault or mistaken policy in all this, as appertaining to the constitution of a Christian State, it is a fault at least upon the side to which the charity of the Gospel would lead us to incline. If it be *inconsistent*, as the worldly philosopher would object, it is inconsistency proportioned to the weakness and the wants of man; which, however, the pride of that philosophy can ill brook, *we* are taught to expect and to provide for in the Word of God⁹."

We cannot, also, but express our extreme surprise that so acute and able a writer as Mr. Gladstone, should have condescended to the perpetration of such a piece of clap-trap as is contained in the sentence, "Away with the servile doctrine that *religion* cannot live without the aid of Parliaments." Very similar to this is the advice which the "Guardian" kindly gave, on the 12th of May, to those who, unfortunately, happen to be "misled" by the arguments of Mr. Wordsworth! "There cannot," says the "Guardian," "be a more fatal delusion for the Church than to trust to any strength but that of her Divine mission, or rely on any support that the world can give her." This is a very transparent, and scarcely honest, attempt to range, under one common term, all those who do not choose to adopt Mr. Gladstone's new theory—to insinuate that all who wish to support the union of Church and State for the sake of the

⁹ Sermon, &c. pp. 19, 20.

English people, are, therefore, upholders of the Erastian principle of a "State Church;" that Mr. Wordsworth and ourselves oppose Mr. Gladstone and the "Guardian" on the same principles, and on the same grounds, as the Dean of Bristol or the "Record;" an assumption so ridiculous, that we shall not waste a single word in refuting it further. Mr. Wordsworth has, on this point, most ably shown the untenable nature of Mr. Gladstone's position.

"I will not deny," he says, "that Religion may live (if it so please God) without the aid of Parliaments, though of the certainty and reasonableness of this assumption, under our own circumstances, I shall have somewhat to say by-and-by;—but there is another question that occurs, and which you ought not, I think, to have kept (as you have done) entirely out of sight—Can Parliaments live without the aid of Religion? On the only occasion when the experiment has been made in this country, not one of the three Estates survived; first expired the Estate of the Lords Spiritual; next the Estate of the Lords Temporal; and lastly, the House of Commons itself became a prey to its own infatuated pursuit of 'Religious Freedom.' What became of God's anointed, also, need not be told. And here I must confess I am surprised that no word of regret should have escaped you in advocating a principle, by which, as you showed so eloquently in your former work, a Christian statesman abdicates all the more noble functions of his high office. 'In such a case,' you observed, 'I do not hesitate to say, the political function would, from the master-science of the world, be reduced to the lowest of all arts.' And again, 'The function of government will be the lowest of all functions, not in an earthly but in a Christian sense, because it will be the farthest removed from its own proper nature.' So little, then, in fact, do the duties of a Christian and a citizen coincide, in the consequences of the view which you now propound¹!"

Most admirably also has Mr. Wordsworth shown the fallacy of Mr. Gladstone's plea, that he supports "religious liberty" from a regard for "Divine truth," as a security against the mutilation of Christian doctrine. We shall run no risk of wearying our readers by the length of our quotation:—

"The point of view," says Mr. Wordsworth, "from which you would urge this motive, is, no doubt, the conviction^{*} you entertain and have before expressed, that unless we embark upon your new theory of Religious Freedom, the Christian religion itself *will and must be* mutilated under the seal of civil authority. I do not disguise from myself the difficulties in which the Church is placed, but I cannot see cause either for the extreme fear which you embrace, or (still less) for the practical conclusion which you would draw from it. For to what does

¹ Letter to Mr. Gladstone, pp. 20, 21.

this practical conclusion really amount? Does it not amount to this—that you are abandoning the Truth of God in a case actually present, in order to secure it in a case which (if it please God) may never occur? I hardly know whether you will allow me to refer (so sad and confounding is the crisis that has come over us!) to what you have yourself previously published upon this head: but if the testimony of Scripture was such as you pronounced it in 1841, it cannot be otherwise in 1852. The times, indeed, are changed, '*et nos mutamur*,' the greatest revolution of all. Circumstances are changed—changed, in many respects, I am thankful to say, for the better—changed also in some, I lament with you, for the worse. But whatever else has undergone change, the Word of God remains the same. The authority of that Word was claimed by you—and claimed, I believe, rightly—for the principles which you formerly advocated; it cannot therefore be claimed for the diametrically opposite theory which you now propound. If it was Scripturally true in 1841, that differences of religion are not to be held by a statesman as indifferent things; if it was Scripturally true that the Truth of God, being one, has an inalienable prerogative against error even in the things of this life; if it was Scripturally true that the professors of the truth, however feebly and inconsistently held, are bound to maintain it and assert its claims in every station and by every means which Religion and the Law permit; if it was Scripturally true that the backslidings of a Christian State, no more than the sinfulness of a baptized man, are no arguments for continuance, still less for advancement, in a vicious and unchristian course; if Repentance was the only remedy prescribed to States no less than to individuals in the Word of God; if these things, I say, were Scripturally true, as you certainly thought them in 1841, they cannot have become false *under any circumstances* in 1852²."

Then he contrasts Mr. Gladstone's present view with his former opinions, and thus proceeds:—

"Now you must excuse me if I say that the Word of God ought not to be treated with inconsistency like this without the offer of some explanation on your part, nor without eliciting a solemn protest from the Ministers of that Word. The passages I have quoted, in maintenance of your former doctrine, as founded on Scripture, were inscribed to the University of Oxford—the contradictory theory which you now propound, with equal profession of regard for Divine truth, is inscribed to the Primus of the Church in Scotland. I have reason to feel for both, and believe me, I do feel deeply for both—under, what seems to me, the indignity you put upon them. For consider, I entreat you, what you are bringing upon us all! You are teaching us to tamper with the evidence of the written Word, at a time when, most of all, we have occasion for the guidance of that Word. It is true we have seen of late so much of such tampering in the conduct of many towards the

² Letter to Mr. Gladstone, &c. pp. 27, 28.

Church of Rome, that there is a fear of our becoming callous and indifferent to what formerly would have filled us with horror and amazement. As affecting the character of individuals whom we had learnt to respect and love, it is no small occasion of regret and pain that their vacillations have been attended with no suitable degree of modesty and self-distrust; but who can calculate the moral misery that must ensue when radical changes are admitted, without remonstrance, into the region of Scripture evidence, and when, under the plea of zeal for Divine truth, that truth itself, as we ourselves formerly interpreted it—not privately, but in the face of all the world, friends and foes, believers and unbelievers—is to be not indeed openly resisted and gainsayed, but passed by and trodden under foot, as a thing of nought?

"Accepting the truths which you formerly taught us, on the authority of Scripture, we—I venture to speak for others as well as for myself—we cannot bring ourselves—as you would now teach us, to embrace their contradictories. We cannot argue, as you have done, in behalf of what we utterly abhor; we cannot discard the sentiments which we once pronounced to be Divine; still less can we seek to press the acceptance of the opposite doctrine upon other men. We, or rather our Divine Lord in us, may be wronged and robbed, but we cannot therefore consent to acquiesce in the spoliation without a murmur, as you would have us, or to share with the robbers their ill-gotten spoil³."

We must give one more extract from Mr. Wordsworth, before leaving our consideration of his and Mr. Gladstone's letters, regretting, as we unfeignedly do, that we cannot find room for the whole of his concluding remarks, an omission, however, which we earnestly hope all our readers will supply for themselves. We have ever ourselves been of opinion, an opinion we have frequently expressed in these pages, that the conduct of the so-called "Church party," both in the House of Commons and out of it, with respect especially to the perversions to Rome, as well as to the "Papal Aggression," has been, literally, suicidal in its character. They have wantonly thrown away golden—legitimate, and therefore, golden—opportunities of righting themselves with the English people—of recovering the ground which Dr. Newman and his brother perverts had lost for them—of placing sound "Anglican" principles upon a firm, consistent, and enduring basis. As it is, we have gone back at least ten years. We have our work to do over again. We claim very high authority for this statement, the authority of no less a person than D. C. L. himself. Every one knows what great things "Churchmen" were to do at the next election. Every one remembers the glowing reports of the "London Church Union" on this subject. Erastianism, and what D. C. L. likes very much less than Erast-

³ Letter to Mr. Gladstone, &c. pp. 30—32. 34, 35.

ianism, sound "Anglicanism," were to be swept away for ever. But now, how changed the note. Thus, on the very eve of the coming elections, writes D. C. L., in the "Morning Chronicle" of the 29th May:—"Dispassionately weighing all things, I do not believe that the coming general election for members of the House of Commons, is one in which the Church party can hope to make a great impression. The time must be, and at no very distant interval, when the Church of England question will distinctly 'tell' upon the hustings; but, as a fact about which we have no need to feel the least down-hearted, it is not specifically 'on the cards,' as a national question, for the general election of 1852." Most true is all this, and we beg to supply a reason for it. It is so, not as D. C. L. speciously observes, because "other considerations purely political" create that election, but rather, partly, from the perversions to Rome; partly because he and his party, by their infatuated conduct in the House of Commons, by their rabid attacks, in their especial organs, upon all who presumed to take a different view from themselves; and, especially, by his own wanton, sarcastic, and insolent denunciation of those who deserve the highest consideration on the part of English Churchmen—have caused "Church principles" to be a by-word, and a reproach, among the great body of the English people; it is useless to disguise the fact, for so it is; while that party's acknowledged leader, afraid to face an English constituency, is compelled to seek, in an Irish borough, an appropriate arena for the development of his theory of "religious liberty," for declaring his belief in the "political equality of all religions." We say, then, once more, that, as it is, we have gone back at least ten years. We have our work to do over again. Well, we must do it, in an earnest spirit of love and faith. But we, nevertheless, know who, and who alone, are responsible for that retrogression. We, none the less, intend to take warning from the experience of the past—to take care *that we are not deceived again*. Sure we are of one thing,—that no permanent good can ever be done to the Church of England by any combination, for any purpose, which does not depend upon, which is not *openly* and *avowedly* based upon three grand principles—the one, an earnest determination to resist, peaceably and charitably, but yet, withal, manfully, and unflinchingly, Romish insolence and Romish ERROR; another, an equally earnest determination to abide, under any and every phase of circumstances, within the pale of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND; the third, an uncompromising maintenance, *for the sake of the English people*, of the existing union between Church and State. We would allow every possible latitude of *opinion*, we speak, of course, as to *Churchmen*, within these limits. Without them, ay, and without the *open and*

direct avowal of them, any combination, for whatever purpose, will be but as a rope of sand. Meantime we must wait, till God shall send us opportunity for action, content and thankful to do, in "*quietness and confidence,*" our work, as individuals, in the way that He has appointed for us ; content to wait till He, in His own good time, shall extricate Churchmen from the entanglement in which, thanks, principally, to Mr. Gladstone and D. C. L., they are now involved. Mr. Wordsworth thus truly speaks of the ruinous mischief of the course which Mr. Gladstone, D. C. L., and the party in question, have recently taken :—

"And now I have a few words to say respecting these supposed needs, and the increased difficulties of English Churchmen in general, which have wrought the revolution in your sentiments which I see so much reason to lament. The present condition of the Church in England is not, I apprehend, essentially worse by any new legislative enactment, than it was in 1845, when you were induced to change your Parliamentary course. It is worse only, or chiefly, by the greater audacity of her avowed enemies, and the greater presumption of her mistaken friends, which are, in great measure, I believe, the results of that change. Had there been a party in the House of Commons headed by yourself, prepared to defend the Church, not upon any latitudinarian theory of '*Religious Liberty,*' not upon vague hints of disaffection justly liable to the suspicion of a non-juring movement, or of a tendency towards Rome,—but upon the recognized principles of the constitution, including the Royal Supremacy, exercised within just and lawful bounds,—I, for my part, am well-nigh persuaded that the worst which has befallen the Church during the last five years—the forcing of Dr. Hampden on the see of Hereford,—the reversal of the judgment of the Court of Arches in the case of Mr. Gorham—the rejection of the Bishop of London's Bill for a proper Ecclesiastical Tribunal in causes of doctrine—the refusal of the right of clergy to sit in Convocation—the unfair and utterly unconstitutional proceedings of the Committee of Council on Education—would never have occurred. . . .

"In these circumstances, then, which I have briefly touched upon, I discover, as I think, what chiefly characterizes and aggravates the present condition of the Church in England. An Episcopal Bench which now, perhaps for the first time, does not adequately represent her in the House of Lords—the desertion of those who should have been her champions in the lower House of Parliament, influenced by the teaching of gifted, but misguided men, who have themselves altogether abandoned her for the Church of Rome—the same pernicious influence widely spread among the young and inexperienced, the visionary and self-confident, tending to induce them to '*refine*' upon the wisdom of their forefathers in Politics and Religion—the consequent encouragement given to her enemies to insult and oppress her—the very improvement which has taken place, great and undeniable as it is, in the orthodoxy of her preaching, in her performance of Divine Worship, in the

lives of the Clergy, in the attachment of her Laity, *making the evil that remains to be more keenly felt*—it is to these things that I attribute, more than to any other human cause, the peculiar difficulties which appear for the present so grievous and insurmountable, and which have driven so many others, not only to forsake the course which your precept and example, backed by the judgment of the great and good in all ages, formerly prescribed to them, but to rush into the opposite with all a convert's enthusiasm, which, while it kindles their impatience and displeasure against those whom they once sided with as allies, forbids them to recognize in themselves the unhappy change they have undergone⁴."

And now, then, we are in a position to ask our readers, whether Mr. Gladstone is or is not fairly liable to the charge of "inconsistency" and "vacillation." That he has changed his opinions *in toto* on the subject of the relations between the Church and the State, no one, except the "Guardian," can for a moment doubt. The question is—and in Mr. Gladstone's case it is a very important question—has he changed them perforce, under the influence of circumstances so overwhelming as, at once, to constrain the conviction of all unprejudiced persons; or has he changed them wantonly, recklessly, and without a shadow of real necessity? We leave our readers, with most perfect confidence, to answer for themselves the question here proposed.

But our task must not end here. We should certainly have been little justified in doing violence to our own feelings, and in taking up so much of the attention of our readers, in a mere endeavour to fix a charge of personal inconsistency on Mr. Gladstone. Our purpose is far higher than this. Our purpose is to show the dangerous nature of the *principles* enunciated by that gentleman, and upheld by the so-called organs of the English Church, the "Morning Chronicle" and the "Guardian." We fully, as we said before, acquit Mr. Gladstone and the "Guardian" of any intention of upsetting the existing alliance between Church and State. We cannot say so of the "Morning Chronicle." We cannot believe for a moment, that a journal which advocates the cause of Messrs. Bright and Milner Gibson, of Mr. Cardwell and *Sir James Graham*, *pari passu* with what it considers the cause of the English Church—which professes to uphold the "political equality of all religions," and to vindicate, at the same time, the integrity of the Catholic faith—we cannot suppose that such a journal would feel the smallest possible regret, if the entire relations by which the State of England is, at present, bound to the Church of England, were for ever dissevered. But our business now is, not with intentions, but with tendencies. We do

⁴ Letter to Mr. Gladstone, &c. pp. 49, 50, 51—53.

firmly believe that, if Mr. Gladstone's views of "religious liberty" be sound views—if all religions ought, of right, to be politically equal—then, *as a matter of right also*, the alliance between Church and State *ought* to be at once dissolved; then *ought* Mr. Gladstone and the "Guardian," at once and openly, to fraternize with Mr. Miall and the Nonconformists for the removal of a great monster grievance. We are speaking in most perfect sincerity, and we will prove our words to demonstration. We will endeavour to show Mr. Gladstone and the "Guardian" that, in their sense of the term, "religious liberty" does not, as a fact, exist in England; that, as a fact, all religions are *not* politically equal. Now if we show this, one of two things ought to follow. Either Mr. Gladstone and the "Guardian" ought to abandon their present position as untenable, or else they ought at once to proclaim their earnest desire to *establish* real "religious liberty;" to *make* all religions politically equal in the only way this can really be done, by putting an end altogether to the alliance which does now prevail between "Church and State," and to the consequent favour which is now, as a matter of fact, extended to the English Church.

We apprehend Mr. Gladstone's theory of "religious liberty" will amount to this, that the State, of which the Sovereign is the head, ought to be a mere abstraction—divested altogether of any thing like a personal conscience—having nothing whatever to do with truth or falsehood as such—having no religious opinions, in any shape or way, of its own—but simply acting as a kind of neutral centre, around which all the various denominations of religion are to converge. Well, this is, at all events, an intelligible hypothesis; but does this state of things exist amongst us? and, if not, is Mr. Gladstone prepared to take measures for calling it into existence? Let us see. The "Morning Chronicle," in the article already quoted, thus endeavours to expose the ingenuous simplicity of Mr. Wordsworth! "Perhaps he is also of opinion that the present mode of appointing bishops, and the present condition of the Church's synods, are amply compensated by the *important fact* that the Archbishop of Canterbury *still* crowns the Sovereign." Mark the sneer—"The important fact!" Certainly the fact is rather "important," and why? Because, for one reason, it is a practical denial of the existence in England of Mr. Gladstone's "religious liberty." We beg to ask the "Morning Chronicle" and Mr. Gladstone, what possible right, on their principles, *has* the Archbishop of Canterbury to crown the Sovereign—we mean, of course, what exclusive right! The State, as such, and of course, therefore, the Sovereign, as head of the State, is to show no favour whatever to any religious

denomination. But who will say that the exclusive right of crowning the Sovereign of England is compatible, in any shape or way, with this theory? Surely, if the Archbishop performs this solemn office, *as the spiritual head of the English Church*, then direct and palpable favour is shown to that particular religious denomination of which he is the head; and, thereby, direct and palpable injustice, on Mr. Gladstone's theory, is committed against the head of every other religious denomination. If Mr. Gladstone is prepared to allow that the Archbishop of Canterbury ought, on the occurrence of the next coronation, to cast lots—for we suppose the Sovereign must be crowned by somebody—to *cast lots* with the Cardinal "Archbishop of Westminster," with the various heads of the different dissenting interests, and with the Jewish Chief Rabbi—we suppose Mr. Gladstone will take him in—for the *privilege*, not the *right*, of crowning the Sovereign; well, in that case, let him honestly and manfully say so. If he will not do this, then is his theory of "religious liberty" a gross delusion, an unreal creation of a brain teeming with crude fancies.

Take another instance. Every body knows that before every sitting of the House of Commons, prayer to Almighty God is solemnly offered up. In his former work, Mr. Gladstone thus eloquently referred to the practice, on this head, which prevails *in America*.

"Looking again to the other end of the scale, and passing from the most theistical of ancient philosophies to that one among modern nations whose public institutions are least so of all wherein Christianity is generally professed by the people, the inquirer will derive even from the practice of America an attestation of our principle, that, viewing governments as made up of human beings, there immediately and inevitably arises a necessity for their having a collective worship. The meetings of her legislative body are opened with prayer. *True it is that prayer may be and is offered by ministers of the most various and conflicting persuasions: by Roman Catholic, Anglo-American, Baptist, Unitarian: probably the enumeration has a far wider range in principle than even this. We speak not here of the abstract consistency or propriety of this heterogeneous worship: but we highly value the acknowledgment, more conspicuous amidst such anomalies, that where there is a government there should be a worship, a religion*."

Now, of course, in his next edition, Mr. Gladstone will alter and amend this passage. He, of course, will then refer to the practice of our American friends, not by way of censure, but by way of the very highest praise! He will, doubtless, refer to the

⁵ The State, &c. pp. 32, 33.

fact that "prayer may be and is offered by ministers of the most various and conflicting persuasions," as showing the existence of real, genuine, unadulterated "religious liberty" in the United States! But then, equally of course, he ought to do his best to introduce a similar system of action into our own legislature. For see the glaring and palpable injustice of our present system. In the British House of Commons, that visible embodiment of the "political equality of all religions," as a matter of fact, religious worship is exclusively performed by a minister of one favoured denomination—by a priest of the English Church! We say confidently, that unless Mr. Gladstone, the "*Guardian*," and the "*Morning Chronicle*," are prepared, at once, to amend this most wanton act of injustice—unless they will do their best to bring it to pass that Cardinal Wiseman, Dr. Binney, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the other heads of the "various conflicting persuasions"—having, of course, ballotted for precedence—shall, for the future, offer up in rotation solemn prayer to Almighty God, at each sitting of the British House of Commons—then is their theory of "religious liberty," of the "political equality of all religions," neither more nor less than a mockery, a delusion, and a snare! We leave Mr. Gladstone to take which alternative he pleases—to carry out his principles manfully, or to give them up as untenable. We submit, as a fact, that we have proved our position, that what he considers "religious liberty," pure and simple, does not *yet* exist in England. We pass over, as of minor importance, the coronation oath—the oath taken by Romish Members of Parliament—and a few small matters of a similar kind. We are content to rest the issue we have raised upon the two instances we have already mentioned. If Mr. Gladstone will *not* consent to amend, in the way we have suggested, the present unjust system, then his theory of "religious liberty" will not hold water. If he will, then is he bound, at once, to do all he can to sever the alliance between Church and State, because, by virtue alone of that alliance, are exclusive privileges afforded by the State to the English Church. We leave Mr. Gladstone to make his choice.

Since the above was written, the "*Guardian*," finding that Mr. C. Wordsworth's masterly letter is exciting rather too much attention, has issued an "apology" for Mr. Gladstone, in another "leading article" of the 3rd June. We notice the article for two reasons: first, because it has a very direct bearing upon our present subject; and, secondly, because it offers a lamentable specimen of what, in another communion, we should characterize as Jesuitism. There are three points to be noticed. First, we are told that "Mr. Wordsworth's

misconception of Mr. Gladstone is as complete as, his position and attainments considered, it is extraordinary." When did the "Guardian" first find this out? Is it not still more "extraordinary," that the "Guardian," on the 12th May, when *justifying* Mr. Gladstone against Mr. Wordsworth, actually ignored altogether this "extraordinary misconception?" Surely then was the time to expose Mr. Wordsworth's stupidity, and not now, when it is so obviously done "for a purpose." But, moreover, we are told, that "besides, it should be remembered, that Mr. Wordsworth holds opinions on the union of Church and State happily almost peculiar to himself, and means by their separation something very different from what is commonly understood by that term." How far the "Guardian" correctly apprehends Mr. Wordsworth's views, we will inquire presently; but, at any rate, those views are not, or certainly were not, "peculiar to himself," inasmuch as they are, *ipso facto*, the very identical views which Mr. Gladstone formerly propounded in his great work on "Church and State." But what are Mr. Wordsworth's views according to the "Guardian?" "Mr. Wordsworth holds, *if we understand him*,"—there is great virtue in your "if,"—"that there is an absolute obligation, to be deduced from Scripture, upon every State to support and foster a national Church, which Church can never, without actual sin, on her own part, *allow herself to be severed from the State*." Now for the logical consequence. "The ultimate result of which appears to be, that the Church *must surrender herself bound hand and foot, doctrine, discipline, and all, into the hands of the civil power*." Now, will the "Guardian" undertake to explain, how two separate and independent bodies *could* be so *united*, as that one should not "*allow itself*" to be separated from the other? If the State chose to insist upon separation, how could the Church possibly prevent it? We are sure that Mr. Wordsworth never intended to say any thing so perfectly absurd! But, setting aside the absurdity, is the "Guardian's" account of Mr. Wordsworth's view in any way correct? We say confidently it is not. Mr. Wordsworth's view, *if we mistake not*, is this, as it was formerly Mr. Gladstone's, that, upon Scriptural grounds, the State *ought* "to support and foster a national Church;" and, moreover, that, where the alliance exists, as in this country, the Church is bound, by the allegiance she owes to her Divine Master, to do *all in her power* to maintain that alliance—to bear and suffer any thing, short of a positive denial of Christian Truth, rather than *by any act of her own to cause* it to be severed. If the State *will* sever it, she must protest and submit, but do nothing to further the unrighteous deed. As Mr. Wordsworth

felicitously said, "in another paper," in a letter which the "Guardian" refused to insert entire, if the State chose to "commit suicide," we, as Churchmen, are not, therefore, "to load the pistol, and to draw the trigger." Now the "Guardian" had seen, and actually referred to, that letter, and yet, in spite of it, it thought proper to misrepresent, as above, the views of Mr. Wordsworth.

But not simply has that paper misrepresented Mr. Wordsworth: it actually endeavours to nullify the effect of Mr. Gladstone's "Letter to Bishop Skinner," by representing it as "the Letter of a Scotch Churchman to a Scotch Bishop;" and, therefore, containing arguments and statements which were never intended to apply to the Church of England! The "Guardian" gravely maintains, that any apprehension as to the *tendency* of Mr. Gladstone's Letter, to weaken and disturb the union between Church and State, is perfectly groundless, because that letter is addressed to the Bishop of an unestablished Church! "In any practical sense, therefore, and *as applied to the Church of England*, we believe the charge against Mr. Gladstone to be utterly without foundation." Now this is really too bad! We are quite sure that Mr. Gladstone is far too honourable a man to countenance the miserable evasion, to which the "Guardian" has had recourse. Will the "Guardian" venture to deny that the whole bearing of Mr. Gladstone's letter is to lay down certain principles, *as of universal application*, which principles are carried out, in the Church of Scotland, in the greatest perfection, *because* that Church is unfettered by the "trammels" of the State? Will the "Guardian" venture to deny that, under this impression, Mr. Gladstone's Letter has been applauded to the skies by all who look to the Scotch Church with anxious and longing gaze; that, under this impression, the primary review of that Letter appeared in its own columns; that, under this impression, the "Morning Chronicle" reviewed it also? And yet forsooth, knowing all this, we, of the English Church, are not to feel the smallest alarm at the palpable *tendency* of that Letter, because it was addressed to a Scotch Bishop! If Mr. Gladstone's views on the relations between the Church and State, in England, are really unaltered, since 1847, let him withdraw his "Letter to Bishop Skinner." No one would hail that withdrawal with more thankfulness than ourselves. But, *until then*, we must regard that Letter as having a most direct *tendency* to unsettle those relations. The "Morning Chronicle" is, at any rate, very much more frank than the "Guardian" on this point. By a singular coincidence, on the very same day, the "Chronicle" boldly and openly takes ground, diametrically opposed to that of

the "Guardian." We will quote the particular passage, bearing on our present subject, and then leave our readers to judge, whether English Churchmen have, or have not, a right to feel alarmed at the *tendency* of Mr. Gladstone's Letter.

Thus speaks the "Morning Chronicle" on the 3rd of June:—

"His," Mr. Gladstone's, "problem, therefore, is to find a way for the Church to do her own work, *non obstante* the *unchristian character*⁶ of the State. And he solves it by saying, '*Let the State develop its principles; let it forego interference with or recognition of religion; let it not meddle with any sects; let it not prescribe Jews or Roman Catholic dignitaries; for, if it be consistent, the Church cannot but gain, and she must, in the end, be free.* If, however, I claim entire liberty for the Church of England at the hands of an assembly which does not consist of members of her communion, how can I, in honesty and consistency, ask this same assembly to *persecute* and prescribe other religious bodies for her sake.' Such is the obvious *rationale* of Mr. Gladstone's treatment of the Jew question, and of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill."

But the sophistry of the "Guardian" does not end here. It actually endorses its own *latest* view of Mr. Gladstone's letter, by an enumeration of certain eminent persons, who, for totally different reasons with the "Guardian," deprecate opposition to Mr. Gladstone! "So, *we presume*, believe the bishops, archdeacons, and cathedral dignitaries innumerable, who have come forward to protest against a disturbance of his seat. So thinks Archdeacon Hale; so thinks Dr. Hook; so thinks Sir Thomas Acland." Why did not the "Guardian" add, "so thinks *Dr. Lushington*; so thinks *Master Senior*; so thinks *Mr. Labouchere*!" The "Guardian" knows, as well as we know, that very many, among others, we doubt not, the persons it has mentioned, deprecate opposition to Mr. Gladstone's return, on grounds which have nothing whatever to do with any, the smallest, recognition of his peculiar views on "Church and State." They deprecate it because of University etiquette; because of Mr. Gladstone's eminent usefulness in the House of Commons as a statesman; because he is the firm upholder of the privileges of the University; but, especially, we believe, because, whatever may be his private theories, Mr. Gladstone is far too honourable a man to carry those theories into practical operation, until he has, on this particular question, himself taken some steps, following Sir Robert Peel's example in 1829, to ascertain the feeling of his constituency. Most earnestly, for our own part, do we hope that that time may never arrive; but if, unhappily, it ever should, the "Guardian" will find that

⁶ The italics are ours.

English Churchmen are quite prepared to do their duty alike to the Church of England, and to the University of Oxford.

And now a few words by way of conclusion. We have thought it our duty to draw the particular attention of English Churchmen to the question of "Church and State," because we firmly believe that the present and future usefulness of the Church depends, under God, mainly upon the view which they take of that question. It is utterly impossible to shut our eyes to the fact, that the relations between the Church and State are, from within the Church, most seriously endangered at the present moment. The *tendency* of the present views of Mr. Gladstone, of the "Guardian" and of the "Morning Chronicle," is, palpably, towards a "free" and unestablished Church. We believe that many persons devoutly wish for such a consummation. We believe that very many more are now siding with these persons for particular objects, who do not, really, desire any thing of the kind, but who will, unless they retrace their steps in time, be drawn, when the crisis comes, into the vortex along with them. We do not wonder at this, much as we lament it. The present position of matters has been caused, mainly, by the Papal aggression, or rather, by the course which certain parties, in and out of Parliament, pursued with reference to that transaction. At the time that event occurred Churchmen were smarting under the injustice of the Gorham judgment. Their irritation was increased by the "Durham Letter." When the question of invoking the aid of Parliament against that aggression arose, many were afraid of appearing to depend on the State for protection, from recent events; while others, who really desired, as we believe, direct separation, openly repudiated the secular arm, and raised the cuckoo cry of "religious liberty," for the purpose of more directly furthering the end they had in view. The conduct of the first of these two parties was, we think, most mistaken and ill-judged, though easily accounted for. The line they should have taken was perfectly clear. They should have said, "while, on the one hand, we deprecate any undue interference, on the part of the State, with the internal organization of the Church, we still, so long as the Church and the State are united, are entitled to demand that the State shall defend the Church against the wanton insolence of Romish aggression." As it is, the two parties are now, virtually, united in what we cannot but deem a very inauspicious and unholy alliance. It is with a view of opening the eyes of the one party to the real state of the case, of inducing them to pause ere it be too late, that this paper has been written. If they who do not desire that the State should be "unchristianized" fraternize any longer,

no matter for what purpose, with those who do not care one atom whether the State be CHRISTIAN OR APOSTATE, who *desire* that it should "develop its principles," foregoing altogether any "interference with" or "recognition of *religion*," the consequences must be upon their own heads. For ourselves, we can only say that while we are not insensible to the altered condition of the relations between the Church and the State since the repeal of the "Test" Act—since the passing of the Act of 1829,—while we feel, as acutely as men can feel, the injustice with which, on the part of the civil power, the Church has lately been treated—while we would join, heart and soul, in the endeavour to obtain justice for her—while we would extend, by every means in our power, her spiritual efficiency, we would still, *so long as our Prayer Book remains unaltered*, rather submit patiently to any amount of oppression than, by any act of our own, promote the dissolution of the existing alliance; not for the sake of the Church—not from any mere desire to preserve endowments and temporalities, for, if robbed of these, we would say, in "quietness and confidence," *Jehovah Jireh*—but simply and solely for the sake of preserving the Christian character of the State. It is speciously urged that that alliance cripples the energies and impedes the usefulness of English Churchmen, as individuals. We do not believe it. So long as we look upon our spiritual mother as a Divine institution, perfectly distinct from, perfectly independent of, though happily united with the State—so long as her Clergy are impressed with a due appreciation of the Divine commission with which they are invested—they will do her work in an earnest spirit of love and faith, in spite of, aye, and we verily believe, all the more zealously because of, the injustice with which she is treated. Sure we are, that by so doing, they take the most effectual course whereby that injustice may, ultimately, be removed. And most sure are we, also, that by allowing a shadow of doubt and suspicion to rest upon them in reference to this great question, not only are they themselves the real causes of the perpetuation of that injustice, but they render nugatory and ineffectual any efforts they, as individuals, make, in spreading the faith of the Church among the English people. Let them show the people that, while protesting against the unlawful, they are still prepared dutifully to uphold the lawful "supremacy" of their Sovereign; that, while fully determined to resist State aggression, they are yet equally determined that, *so far as they are concerned*, "the Church of England shall still remain a national Church'," and they will be trusted and revered by those, whom the faintest whisper of "separation"

' Letter of Mr. Disraeli to the electors of Bucks.

would drive from them at once and for ever. At all events, let us have no more halting, or indecision, in the matter. Let us at least know the course which men really intend to take respecting it. We shall then know our real position, and our real strength. Let us have candour and fair dealing, and we have no fear whatever of the final result. "Because therefore," we use, in conclusion, the striking language which Mr. Gladstone formerly used:—

"Because the government stands with us in a paternal relation to the people, and is bound in all things to consider not merely their existing tastes, but the capabilities and ways of their improvement; because it has both an intrinsic competency and external means to amend and assist their choice; because to be in accordance with God's word and will it must have a religion, and because in accordance with its conscience that religion must be the truth as held by it under the most solemn and accumulated responsibilities; because this is the only sanctifying and preserving principle of society, as well as to the individual that particular benefit, without which all others are worse than valueless; *we must disregard the din of political contention*, and the pressure of worldly and *momentary* motives, and in behalf of our regard to man, as well as of our allegiance to God, maintain among ourselves, where happily it still exists, the union between the Church and the State⁹."

POSTSCRIPT.

WHILE these sheets are passing through the press, a letter has appeared from Mr. Gladstone, addressed to Mr. Greswell, "emphatically denying, in all their parts," any allegations which have been made against him, with respect to the Church and State question—a letter which *complicates*, we use the word advisedly, the question at issue between ourselves and the writer of it, in a very remarkable manner. We are compelled to notice Mr. Gladstone's letter, and for this very plain reason, that, if we do not, that letter will be brought forward, when this paper appears, by Mr. Gladstone's friends, as an authoritative reply to our allegations, as well as to those of other parties, with whom we have nothing whatever to do. In justice to Mr. Gladstone, we will give entire those passages of his letter which bear most directly upon the subject of this paper. He says:—

"That the principles of which I am now the advocate are the very same that I avowed, and for the avowal of which I was not sparingly assailed, in 1847;

"That I am aware of no incompatibility between the principles of full religious freedom, and the maintenance of the national Church in

⁹ The State, &c., p. 83.

connection with the State, to both of which I am now, as ever, cordially attached ;

"That, in regard to the latter of these objects, if the change in my convictions which is imputed to me had occurred, I should not have left it to the author of this circular to announce it to the world ; and

"That whether the question be or be not an open one for others, it can, in my judgment, be no open question for one who aspires to the representation of the University of Oxford.

"In short, I disown and repudiate both these allegations emphatically, and in all their parts'."

Now, we trust our readers will fully believe us when we say that we should have been delighted beyond measure, if we could have considered the letter of Mr. Gladstone as a satisfactory reply to the allegations it has been our very painful duty to make, with respect to that gentleman, in this paper. We regret that we cannot do so. Whatever weight ought to attach to any thing we have hitherto said, ought still to attach to our arguments and our allegations, *non obstante* Mr. Gladstone's letter. Let us consider this question. "The principles," says Mr. Gladstone, "of which I am now the advocate are the very same that I avowed, and for the avowal of which I was not sparingly assailed, in 1847." Now we do not, for a moment, dream of imputing a shadow of insincerity to Mr. Gladstone on this point, but we cannot forbear asking him how he can possibly reconcile this assertion with the fact that the especial and peculiar organs of his party, the "Guardian" and the "Morning Chronicle," have, both of them, in answer to Mr. Wordsworth, fully and frankly avowed a direct and radical change of opinion, on his part, with respect to the question of "religious liberty"—a question, as we have shown, connected most intimately with the alliance between the Church and the State? We have already quoted the "Guardian," *not of the 19th*, but of the 12th May, on this subject. If our readers will recur to that extract, they will see that passages from Mr. Gladstone's earlier and later writings are admitted to be "totally irreconcilable;" they will see the frank admission that Mr. Gladstone has "changed his mind;" nay, more than this, that it "is not any one's business to defend Mr. Gladstone from a complete alteration of recorded opinions." "We may concede," says the "Guardian," "without reserve, to Mr. Wordsworth"—surely, therefore, to any one else—"that having written strongly in favour of a state conscience, and of the maintenance of a particular form of religion by the civil power, Mr. Gladstone is now to be found writing as decidedly, and certainly with no loss of

power, on that of 'religious liberty.'" Let our readers mark the very important admission here that there is a clear and direct antagonism between Mr. Gladstone's present theory of "religious liberty," and his former theory of the State "having a conscience," of its being the bounden duty of the civil power "to maintain a religion." Surely it must follow, logically, if the State *ought* not now to "have a conscience,"—*ought* not now "to maintain a religion,"—that the alliance of the State with the Church *ought* not to be so much as an "open question" with the "Guardian" and with Mr. Gladstone, if the "Guardian" correctly represents that gentleman's opinions. That alliance *ought*, in such a case, at once to be dissolved.

But now for the other "Church" organ, the "Morning Chronicle." In the same article from which we before quoted the change in Mr. Gladstone's views is brought out in even stronger relief than by the "Guardian." After stating its own view of Mr. Wordsworth's theory of Church and State, the "Chronicle" thus proceeds:—

"We are not now denying that this theory of Church and State has its beauties—all we say is, that it and the present times do not by a good deal coincide.

"Mr. Gladstone, it is possible, may once have been taken by the literary beauty and symmetry of this, or of an analogous, view of the relations between Church and State. Time, however, disenchanted him. He came down from reverie to reality¹."

Then come the peculiar views of the "Chronicle," which we spare our readers, and then it is said:—

"Hence, as we suppose, Mr. Gladstone felt it to be his duty to look facts fairly in the face, to *surrender the hollow theory*, and to see whether the Church was not bound to accommodate itself to an altered condition of society. This is the practical side of his public character as a Churchman—he refuses any longer to affect to see in the State what the State is not."

Now, we ask our readers carefully to consider these two extracts, and then we ask further, how is it possible to reconcile them with the letter of Mr. Gladstone? They can only be reconciled in one way, and most glad shall we be if Mr. Gladstone will adopt it. It is just possible that these extracts may now, for the first time, be brought to his notice. If so, he is bound, at once and speedily, to state that fact, and, moreover, to *disavow any, the smallest participation, in the sentiments here imputed to him*. If he will do this, so far well.

¹ Morning Chronicle, April 2.

But Mr. Gladstone goes on to say further, "that I am aware of no incompatibility between the principles of full religious freedom, and the maintenance of the national Church in connection with the State, to both of which I am now, as ever, cordially attached." Now, we do hope that, when Mr. Gladstone favours the world with his disavowal of the sentiments of his so-called organs, he will give us a full, clear, and unmistakeable definition of what he considers "religious freedom." There is a sense in which we can perfectly agree with his dictum as above stated. If he means to say that he would allow, according to his former views, every religious denomination "full and free toleration" on all points not, in any wise, interfering with the paramount and acknowledged claims of the Church of England to especial favour as the established religion of the State, then, of course, we fully agree with him; but, then, we call upon him plainly to say so. If he does, it will be very difficult to reconcile such an assertion with his conduct on the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, with the general tenor of his letter to Bishop Skinner, and with the language of those Journals considered peculiarly to represent his opinions. With that, however, we have nothing to do. We would gladly and readily compound with any transient inconsistency for the sake of getting an avowal from such a man as Mr. Gladstone, that he still adheres to the general principles of his former great work. If, however, he will not do this—but we will wait till we see his definition before we draw our inference.

We approach, finally, a question of great importance, and of very peculiar delicacy. That question is this: supposing Mr. Gladstone should not think proper to give a clear and explicit explanation of the points to which Mr. Wordsworth and ourselves have thought it right to call his peculiar attention, how far ought English Churchmen who adopt Mr. Wordsworth's view of the existing alliance, to be satisfied with Mr. Gladstone's declaration, that he is "now, as ever, cordially attached to the maintenance of the national Church in connection with the State?" We regret to say that, in such a case, supposing it, unhappily, to occur—giving Mr. Gladstone implicit credit for perfect sincerity—believing, in spite of his writings and his conduct, because he says he desires, that he really does desire the maintenance of the existing relation—still, while those writings remain unexplained—while that line of conduct still continues—Churchmen who agree in the main with Mr. Wordsworth and ourselves, must not depend, henceforward, for a single moment, for the maintenance of the alliance, on Mr. Gladstone. Most gladly, most thankfully, would we receive from that gentleman a retraction of his Letter to Bishop Skinner; most gladly and most thankfully would we hail a dis-

avowal of his startling speech and his startling vote on the Ecclesiastical Titles Act ; but, until then, we must, from a sense of the duty we owe to the Church of England, look at Mr. Gladstone's tendencies, rather than at Mr. Gladstone's intentions. We must, at the present day, look at deeds more than words. We cannot, because we dare not, accept Mr. Gladstone's letter to Mr. Greswell, as a satisfactory explanation of, or a sufficient set-off against his advocacy, in his Letter to Bishop Skinner, of the political equality of all religions—for it amounts to that ; or of his maintenance, in the House of Commons, of the right of the Church of Rome to act as if Parliament had long since repealed the restrictive clauses of the Bill of 1829. So long as that line of conduct is continued, we are bound to suppose that Mr. Gladstone endorses the opinion of the "*Morning Chronicle*"—an opinion maintained so lately as the 16th of June, on the occasion of the Queen's recent proclamation respecting Romish processions—that that proclamation "revives a penal enactment which, *by common consent, had quietly gone to sleep for more than twenty years!*" We are bound to feel alarm, even in spite of Mr. Gladstone's letter, when we see a Journal, supported mainly by the "Church" party, one day advocating his re-election, in one of its own peculiarly-written leaders ; the next, asserting, in bitter scorn and derision of a most just and righteous step on the part of Her Majesty's Government, that "*wisely and well had successive administrations allowed that miserable tribute to bigotry which encumbered the Emancipation Act to remain a dead letter!*" We do earnestly hope that our readers will not misunderstand us. We do not dream of doubting that Mr. Gladstone does *now* desire the maintenance of the relations between Church and State which at present exist—we fully believe him when he asserts that *he is* "*aware of no incompatibility between the principles of full religious freedom and the maintenance*" of those relations. But, with great respect for Mr. Gladstone, we demur to the *sufficiency* of that declaration. We are compelled, by sad and bitter experience, to look, not simply at the assertions, but at the *tendency* of the writings, and at the overt acts, of public men. How many, who have now joined the ranks of our bitterest and most implacable foe, were, at one time, perfectly sincere in the belief that *they were* "*aware of no incompatibility between*" the holding "all Roman doctrine" and the most fervent attachment to the Church of England ! Where are those men now ? They are gone whither the legitimate development of their principles inevitably led them, and where every one else could see, long before, that they were gradually going. We *must* think of these things ; and it is because we do think of them, that we cannot accept Mr. Glad-

stone's letter as sufficient to quiet the fears his "best friends" entertain respecting him. Let him once plainly and distinctly assert his entire adherence to the general principles of his former great work,—let him act according to those principles—then, in spite of recent events, will we gladly and thankfully allow that our fears are groundless. But, until that time shall come, we dare not, holding our present views, place any confidence, as Churchmen, in Mr. Gladstone, on the question we are discussing. We are rather compelled to believe, that the principles he has avowed in his letter to Bishop Skinner—that the line of conduct he has adopted in Parliament—do directly tend towards a consummation which every sound English Churchman would not only most deeply deplore, but would endeavour to prevent, by every means in his power. Unless those principles are changed—unless that conduct be altered—we are most firmly convinced that the time must inevitably come, when Mr. Gladstone, and they who agree with him in opinion, will openly advocate the rending asunder of the existing relations between the Church and the State.

ART. VIII.—*Roughing it in the Bush ; or, Life in Canada.* By SUSANNA MOODIE. 2 Vols. London : Bentley.

WE have seldom come across a book more amusing in its quiet humour, or more touching in its simple pathos, than these pictures of an emigrant's life in Canada. A melancholy picture it is, and one, we trust, not to be commonly met with now-a-days. The writer, Mrs. Moodie, a worthy sister of our accomplished female historian, Agnes Strickland, emigrated with her husband some twenty years ago, soon after her marriage, leaving a Scottish home, with all the common comforts we deem necessities of life, and, what her cultivated mind valued far more highly, the luxury of literature, to seek an independence of their own in the Canadian forest and "bush life"—the one so poetical and grand in description, the other so adventurous and amusing to read of, but in reality so dreary, so anxious, so heart-aching.

The volumes contain a series of sketches of their difficulties and struggles, narrated in simple, unaffected language, some anecdotes of her rough neighbours, the *nominal* Indian savage and the more *really* savage settler, interspersed with such charming pictures of the beautiful scenery so lavishly spread around them as to fill us with admiration of the pure and religious mind which was ever ready to draw unfailing comfort and gratitude from its genuine appreciation. We cannot speak too highly of the cheerful fortitude, the womanly unselfishness and energy, with which our authoress seems to have struggled through the hardships of her first fifteen or sixteen years in the new country; living in miserable shanties, with an increasing family, frequent illnesses, runaway servants, sometimes actual want of food, and always an almost total want of comfort, yet ever ready to help the few within her reach whose lot was equally hard; and even in her most dismal straits bracing her mind by the employment of her natural gifts with pen and pencil. Her patriotic lyrics seem to have attracted much attention during the Canadian troubles; and ultimately her writings and her drawings enabled her to add something to their slender purse; while at the close of the book we have a glimpse of an appointment which restored them to some sort of comfort and society. Who can wonder that Mrs. Moodie, however proud of the potatoes she planted and dug herself, the cows she milked, the dandelion coffee and maple sugar she made, should speak of emigration to the backwoods of Canada as a hazardous experiment for all who have not been accustomed from infancy to battle with a strong and sinewy arm

against the *physical* difficulties of life? Who will not forgive her for exclaiming somewhat bitterly against the cruelty of the designing "land-jobber," who, concealing the toil and the hardship, tempted and duped the poor but refined and cultivated gentleman into misery, home-sickness, and despair. She says:

"To the poor, industrious working man it presents many advantages; to the poor gentleman, *none*! The former works hard, puts up with coarse, scanty fare, and submits, with a good grace, to hardships that would kill a domesticated animal at home. Thus he becomes independent, inasmuch as the land that he has cleared finds him in the common necessities of life; but it seldom, if ever, in remote situations, accomplishes more than this. The gentleman can neither work so hard, live so coarsely, nor endure so many privations as his poorer but more fortunate neighbour. Unaccustomed to manual labour, his services in the field are not of a nature to secure for him a profitable return. The task is new to him—he knows not how to perform it well; and, conscious of his deficiency, he expends his little means in hiring labour, which his bush-farm can never repay. Difficulties increase, debts grow upon him, he struggles in vain to extricate himself, and finally sees his family sink into hopeless ruin."—Vol. ii. p. 291.

This sounds sad enough; but as a reality let us take a picture of our authoress in her new log-house, nine miles of uncleared forest from the nearest village, at a time when her only servant had left her at a moment's notice, with two children both under three years of age:—

"Ague and lake fever had attacked our new settlement. The men in the shanty were all down in it; and my husband was confined to his bed on each alternate day, unable to raise hand or foot, and raving in the delirium of the fever. After much difficulty, and only by offering enormous wages, I succeeded in procuring a nurse to attend upon me in my confinement. The woman had not been a day in the house before she was attacked by the same fever. In the midst of this confusion, and with my precious little Addie lying insensible on a pillow at the foot of my bed—expected every moment to breathe her last sigh—on the night of the 26th of August, the boy I had so ardently coveted was born. The next day, old Pine carried his wife (my nurse) away upon his back, and I was left to struggle through in the best manner I could, with a sick husband, a sick child, and a new-born babe. The days that my husband was free of the fit, he did what he could for me and his poor sick babes, but, ill as he was, he was obliged to sow the wheat, to enable the man to proceed with the drag, and was therefore necessarily absent in the field the greater part of the day. I was very ill, yet for hours at a time I had no friendly voice to cheer me, to proffer me a drink of cold water, or attend to the poor babe; and worse, still worse, there was no one to help that pale, marble child, who lay so cold and still, with half-closed violet eye, as if death had already chilled her heart in his iron

grasp. My husband continued to suffer for many weeks with the ague; and when he was convalescent, all the children, even the poor babe, were seized with it, nor did it leave us till late in the following spring."—Vol. ii. pp. 79—82.

After this melancholy scene, we must go back to their first settlement in the backwoods, which, though not very encouraging to them, will be amusing to our readers. They had rashly engaged upon hearsay, and at a high price, what was called a "comfortable home," on their new land, and commenced their first "bush" journey on a pouring autumn day. At the end of the second day,—

"The carriage turned into a narrow, steep path, overhung with lofty woods, and after labouring up it with considerable difficulty, and at the risk of breaking our necks, it brought us at length to a rocky upland clearing, partially covered with a second growth of timber, and surrounded on all sides by the dark forest.

" 'I guess,' quoth our Yankee driver, 'that at the bottom of this 'ere swell, you'll find yourself *to hum*;' and plunging into a short path cut through the wood, he pointed to a miserable hut, at the bottom of a steep descent, and cracking his whip, exclaimed, ' 'Tis a smart location that. I wish you Britishers may enjoy it.' I gazed upon the place in perfect dismay, for I had never seen such a shed called a house before. 'You must be mistaken; that is not a house, but a cattle-shed, or a pig-sty.'

"The man turned his knowing, keen eye upon me, and smiled, half-humorously, half-maliciously, as he said,

" 'You were raised in the old country, I guess; you've much to learn, and more, perhaps, than you'll like to know, before the winter is over.'

"I was perfectly bewildered—I could only stare at the place, with my eyes swimming in tears; but as the horses plunged down into the broken hollow, my attention was drawn from my new residence to the perils which endangered life and limb at every step. The driver, however, was well used to such roads, and, steering us dexterously between the black stumps, at length drove up, not to the door, for there was none to the house, but to the open space from which that absent, but very necessary appendage, had been removed. Three young steers and two heifers, which the driver proceeded to drive out, were quietly reposing on the floor. A few strokes of the whip, and a loud burst of gratuitous curses, soon effected an ejection; and I dismounted, and took possession of this untenable tenement. Moodie was not yet in sight with the teams. I begged the man to stay till he arrived, as I felt terrified at being left alone in this wild, strange-looking place. He laughed, as well he might, at our fears, and said he had a long way to go, and must be off; then, cracking his whip, and nodding to the girl, who was crying aloud, he went his way, and Hannah and myself were left standing in the middle of the dirty floor.

"The prospect was indeed dreary. Without, pouring rain; within, a fireless hearth; a room with but one window, and that containing only one whole pane of glass; not an article of furniture to be seen, save an old painted pine-wood cradle, which had been left there by some freak of fortune. This, turned upon its side, served us for a seat, and there we impatiently awaited the arrival of Moodie, Wilson, and a man whom the former had hired that morning to assist on the farm. Where they were all to be stowed might have puzzled a more sagacious brain than mine. It is true there was a loft, but I could see no way of reaching it, for ladder there was none; so we amused ourselves, while waiting for the coming of our party, by abusing the place, the country, and our own dear selves for our folly in coming to it."—Vol. i. pp. 84, 85.

But we must not lose Mrs. Moodie's first introduction to her neighbours:—

"While we were all thus busily employed, the door was suddenly pushed open, and the apparition of a woman squeezed itself into the crowded room. I left off arranging the furniture of a bed, that had just been put up in a corner, to meet my unexpected, and, at that moment, not very welcome guest. Her whole appearance was so extraordinary that I felt at a loss how to address her. Imagine a girl of seventeen or eighteen years of age, with sharp, knowing-looking features, a forward, impudent carriage, and a pert, flippant voice, standing upon one of the trunks, and surveying all our proceedings in the most impertinent manner. The creature was dressed in a ragged, dirty, purple stuff gown, cut very low in the neck, with an old red cotton handkerchief tied over her head; her uncombed, tangled locks falling over her thin, inquisitive face, in a state of perfect nature. Her legs and feet were bare; and in her coarse, dirty red hands she swung to and fro an empty glass decanter.

"'What can she want?' I asked myself. 'What a strange creature!'

"And there she stood, staring at me in the most unceremonious manner, her keen black eyes glancing obliquely to every corner of the room, which she examined with critical exactness.

"Before I could speak to her, she commenced the conversation with drawling through her nose,

"'Well, I guess you're fixing here.'

"I thought she had come to offer her services; and I told her I did not want a girl, for I had brought one out with me.

"'How!' responded the creature, 'I hope you don't take me for a help. I'd have you to know that I'm as good a lady as yourself. No, I just stepped over to see what was going on. I seed the teams pass our'n about noon, and I says to father, 'Them strangers are cum; I'll go and look arter them.' 'Yes,' says he, 'do, and take the decanter along; may be they'll want one to put their whiskey in.' 'I'm goin' to,' says I; 'so I cum across with it, an' here it is. But, mind—

don't break it—'tis the only one we have to hum; and father says 'tis so mean to drink out of green glass.'

"My surprise increased every minute. It seemed such an act of disinterested generosity thus to anticipate what we had never thought of. I was regularly taken in.

" 'My good girl,' I began, 'this is really very kind—but'—

" 'Now, don't go to call me 'gall'—and pass off your English airs on us. We are *genuine* Yankees, and think ourselves as good—yes, a great deal better than you. I am a young lady.'

" 'Indeed!' said I, striving to repress my astonishment. 'I am a stranger in the country, and my acquaintance with Canadian ladies and gentlemen is very small. I did not mean to offend you by using the term girl; and was going to assure you that we have no need of the decanter. We have bottles of our own, and we don't drink whiskey.'

" 'How! not drink whiskey? Why, you don't say! How ignorant you must be! May be they have no whiskey in the old country?'

" 'Yes, we have; but it is not like the Canadian whiskey. But pray take the decanter home again; I am afraid it will get broken in this confusion.'

" 'No, no; father told me to leave it, and there it is;' and she planted it resolutely down on the trunk. 'You'll find a use for it till you have unpacked your own.' "

The history of this decanter is so truly Canadian, that we must give it; it remained a mystery to Mr. Moodie, until, a few days after, the Yankee damsel presented herself again.

" 'Well, I guess you look smart! You old-country folks are so stiff, you must have every thing nice, or you fret. But, then, you can easily do it; you have *stacks* of money; and you can fix every thing right off with money.'

" 'Pray take a seat,' and I offered her a chair, 'and be kind enough to tell me your name. I suppose you must live in the neighbourhood, although I cannot perceive any dwelling near us.'

" 'My name! So you want to know my name. I arn't ashamed of my name; 'tis Emily S——. I am eldest daughter to the *gentleman* who owns this house Have you done with that 'ere decanter I brought across yesterday?'

" 'Oh, yes! I have no occasion for it.' I rose, took it from the shelf, and placed it in her hand.

" 'I guess you won't return it empty; that would be mean, father says; he wants it filled with whiskey.'

"The mystery was solved, the riddle made clear. I could contain my gravity no longer, but burst into a hearty fit of laughter, in which I was joined by Hannah. Our young lady was mortally offended; she tossed the decanter from hand to hand, and flared at us with her tiger-like eyes.

“ ‘ You think yourselves smart! Why do you laugh in that way?’

“ ‘ Excuse me, but you have such an odd way of borrowing that I cannot help it I am sorry to disappoint you, but I have no whiskey.’

“ ‘ I guess spirits will do as well; I know there is some in that keg, for I smells it.’

“ ‘ It contains rum for the workmen.’

“ ‘ Better still. I calculate when you’ve been here a few months, you’ll be too knowing to give rum to your helps. But old country-folks are all fools, and that’s the reason they get so easily sucked-in, and be so soon wound-up. Cum, fill the bottle, and don’t be stingy. In this country we all live by borrowing. If you want any thing, why just send and borrow from us.’

“ Thinking this might be the custom of the country, I hastened to fill the decanter, hoping that I might get a little new milk for the poor weanling child; but when I asked my liberal visitor if she kept cows, and would lend me a little new milk for the baby, she burst out into high disdain. ‘ Milk! lend milk? I guess milk in the fall is worth a York shilling a quart. I cannot sell you a drop under.’

“ This was a wicked piece of extortion, as the same article in the towns, where of course it was in greater request, only brought three pence a quart.

“ ‘ If you’ll pay me for it, I’ll bring you some to-morrow. But mind—cash down.’

“ Day after day I was tormented with this importunate creature. She borrowed of me tea, sugar, candles, starch, blueing, irons, pots, bowls; in short, every article in common domestic use—while it was with the utmost difficulty we could get them returned. Articles of food, such as tea and sugar, or of convenience, like candles, starch, soap, she never dreamed of being required at her hands The very day our new plough came home, the father of this bright damsel, who went by the familiar and unenviable title of *Old Satan*, came over to borrow it (though we afterwards found out he had a good one of his own). The land had never been broken up, and was full of rocks and stumps, and he was anxious to save his own from injury; the consequence was, that the borrowed implement came home unfit for use, just at the very time that we wanted to plough for fall wheat. The same happened to a spade and trowel, bought in order to plaster the house. Satan asked the loan of them for *one* hour for the same purpose, and we never saw them again.

“ The daughter came one morning, as usual, on one of these swindling expeditions, and demanded of me the loan of some *fine slack*. Not knowing what she meant, and weary of her importunities, I said I had none. She went away in a rage. Shortly after she came again for some pepper. I was at work, and my work-box was open on the table, stored with threads and spools of all descriptions. Miss Satan cast her hawk’s eye into it, and burst out in her usual rude manner,

“ ‘ I guess you told me a tarnation big lie the other day.’

"Unaccustomed to such language, I rose from my seat, and, pointing to the door, told her to walk out, as I did not choose to be insulted in my own house.

"Your house! I'm sure it's father's," returned the incorrigible wretch. "You told me you had no *fine slack*, and you have *stacks* of it."

"What is fine slack?" said I, very pettishly.

"The stuff that's wound upon these 'ere pieces of wood," pouncing as she spoke upon one of my most serviceable spools.

"I cannot give you that; I want it myself."

"I didn't ask you to give it. I only wants to borrow it till father goes to the creek."

"I wish he would make haste, then, as I want a number of things which you have borrowed of me, and which I cannot longer do without."

"She gave me a knowing look, and carried off my spool in triumph."
—Vol. i. pp. 86—93.

"Another neighbour, an old woman, introduced herself as 'a widow with twelve sons,' adding: '—— and 'tis —— hard to scratch along.'

"Do you swear?"

"Swear! what harm? It eases one's mind when one's vexed. Everybody swears in this country. I used to swear mighty big oaths till about a month ago, when the methody parson told me that if I did not leave it off, I should go to a tarnation bad place; so I dropped some of the worst of them."

"You would do wisely to drop the rest; women in my country never swear."

"Well, you don't say! I always hear'd they were very ignorant."
—Vol. i. p. 96.

Perhaps one of the greatest annoyances of the back-wood settler is, the independence and cavalier behaviour of the servants, or "helps;" a word of reproof, and they are off half an hour after, and for months the family may be left to do every thing, menial or not, for themselves. At best, they do but ring the changes on raw Yankees, half-bred Canadians, and unfortunate emigrants; the best are of the latter class, for the most part, Irish; too reckless and thoughtless to get on for themselves, but affectionate and grateful to those who share their rough comforts with them. One specimen, an Irish foundling, is excellently drawn by Mrs. Moodie; he did his best for his kind master and mistress, but that best was often as amusing a failure as in the following anecdote of him:—

"One evening, John asked for a piece of soap.

"What do you want with soap, John?"

"To wash my shirt, ma'am. Shure an' I'm a baste to be seen, as black as the pots. Sorra a shirt have I but the one, an' it has stuck on my back so long, that I can thole it no longer."

"I looked at the wrists and collar of the condemned garment, which was all of it that John allowed to be visible. They were much in need of soap and water.

" 'Well, John, I will leave you the soap : but can you wash ?'

" 'Och, sure, and I can they. If I soap it enough, and rub long enough, the shirt must come clane at last.'

"I thought the matter rather doubtful; but when I went to bed I left what he required, and soon saw, through the chink in the boards, a roaring fire, and heard John whistling over the tub. He whistled and rubbed, and washed and scrubbed, but, as there seemed no end of the job, and he was as long washing this one garment as Bell would have been performing the same operation on fifty, I laughed to myself, and thought of my own abortive attempts in that way, and went fast asleep. In the morning, John came to his breakfast, with his jacket buttoned up to his throat.

" 'Could you not dry your shirt by the fire, John ? You will get cold wanting it.'

" 'Aha, by dad ! it's dhry enough now. The divil has made tinder of it long afore this.'

" 'Why, what has happened to it ? I heard you washing all night.'

" 'Washing ! Faith, an' I did scrub it till my hands were all ruined intirely, and thin I took the brush to it ; but none a bit of the dirth could I get out of it. The more I rubbed, the blacker it got, until I had used up all the soap, and the perspiration was pouring off me like rain. 'You dirty owld bit of a blackguard of a rag,' says I, in an exthremity of rage, 'you're not fit for the back of a dacent lad an' a jintleman. The divil may take ye to cover one of his imps ;' and with that I sthirred up the fire, and sent it plump into the middle of the blaze.' "

" 'And what will you do for a shirt ?'

" 'Faith, do as many a betther man has done afore me ; go widout.' "

—Vol. i. p. 164.

A still more awkward lad placed them in a terrible situation. They had removed in a better sort of log-house than their first shanty ; and had been employed, during the winter, in clearing the forest round the house ; they waited, however, till summer to burn the fallen trees. Mrs. Moodie was alone with her two infants, a lad, and a maid.

"The day was sultry, and towards noon a strong wind sprung up, that roared in the pine-tops like the dashing of distant billows, but without in the least abating the heat. The children were lying listlessly upon the floor for coolness, when Mary suddenly exclaimed, 'Bless us, mistress, what a smoke !' I ran immediately to the door, but was not able to distinguish ten yards before me. The swamp immediately below us was on fire, and the heavy wind was driving a dense black cloud of smoke directly before us.

“‘What can this mean?’ I cried, ‘who can have set fire to the fallow?’

“As I ceased speaking, John Thomas stood pale and trembling before me. ‘John, what is the meaning of this fire?’

“‘Oh, ma’am, I hope you’ll forgive me; it was I set fire to it, and I would give all I have in the world if I had not done it.’

“‘What is the danger?’

“‘Oh, I’m terribly afraid we shall all be burnt up,’ said the fellow, beginning to whimper.

“‘Why did you run such a risk, and your master from home, and no one in the place to render the least assistance?’

“‘I did it for the best,’ blubbered the lad. ‘What shall we do?’

“‘Why, we must get out of it as fast as we can, and leave the house to its fate.’

“‘We can’t get out,’ said the man, in a low, hollow tone, which seemed the concentration of fear; ‘I would have got out of it if I could; but just step to the back door, ma’am, and see.’

“I had not felt the least alarm till this minute; I had never seen a fallow burnt, but I had heard of it as a thing of such common occurrence that I had never connected it with any idea of danger. Judge then my surprise, my horror, when, on going to the back door, I saw that the fellow, to make sure of his work, had fired the field in fifty different places. Behind, before, on every side, we were surrounded by a wall of fire, burning furiously within a hundred yards of us, and cutting off all possibility of retreat; for could we have found an opening through the burning heaps, we could not have seen our way through the dense canopy of smoke; and, buried as we were in the heart of the forest, no one could discover our situation till we were beyond the reach of help

“A strange calm succeeded my first alarm; tears and lamentations were useless: a horrible death was impending over us, and yet I could not believe that we were to die. I sat down upon the step of the door, and watched the awful scene in silence. The fire was raging in the cedar-swamp, immediately below the ridge on which the house stood, and it presented a spectacle truly appalling. From out the dense folds of a canopy of black smoke, the blackest I ever saw, leaped up continually red forks of lurid flame as high as the tree tops, igniting the branches of a group of tall pines that had been left standing for sun-logs.

“A deep gloom blotted out the heavens from our sight. The air was filled with fiery particles, which floated even to the door-step—while the crackling and roaring of the flames might have been heard at a great distance. Could we have reached the lake shore, where several canoes were moored at the landing, by launching into the water we should have been in perfect safety; but, to attain this object, it was necessary to pass through this mimic hell; and not a bird could have flown over it with unscorched wings. There was no hope in that

quarter, for, could we have escaped the flames, we should have been blinded and choked by the thick, black, resinous smoke.

"The fierce wind drove the flames at the sides and back of the house up the clearing; and our passage to the road, or to the forest, on the right and left, was entirely obstructed by a sea of flames. Our only ark of safety was the house, so long as it remained untouched by the consuming element. I turned to young Thomas, and asked him how long he thought that would be.

" 'When the fire clears this little ridge in front, ma'am. The Lord have mercy upon us, then, or we must all go!'

"The heat soon became suffocating. We were parched with thirst, and there was not a drop of water in the house, and none to be procured nearer than the lake. I turned once more to the door, hoping that a passage might have been burnt through to the water. I saw nothing but a dense cloud of fire and smoke—and could hear nothing but the crackling and roaring of the flames, which were gaining upon us so fast, that I felt their scorching breath in my face.

" 'Ah,' thought I—and it was a most bitter thought—'what will my beloved husband do when he returns and finds we have all perished in this miserable manner! But God can save us yet.'

"The thought had scarcely found a voice in my heart before the wind rose to a hurricane, scattering the flames on all sides into a tempest of burning billows. I buried my head in my apron, for I thought that our time was come, and that all was lost, when a most terrific crash of thunder burst over our heads, and, like the breaking of a water-spout, down came the rushing torrent of rain which had been pent up for so many weeks.

"In a few minutes the chip-yard was all afloat, and the fire effectually checked. The storm which, unnoticed by us, had been gathering all day, and which was the only one of any note we had that summer, continued to rage all night, and before morning had quite subdued our cruel enemy, whose approach we had viewed with such dread."—*Vol. ii. pp. 59—63.*

Mrs. Moodie had an extensive acquaintance among the Indians in her neighbourhood; and she tells much that is very interesting about them,—of their ways and habits, their kind-heartedness, their mythic but simple religion, their honesty and love of truth, and the figurative phraseology which has, perhaps, invested them with a more poetical interest than their natural endowments deserve. The following anecdote merits extract:—

"One of their squaws, . . . had accompanied her husband on a hunting expedition into the forest. He had been very successful, and having killed more deer than they could well carry home, he went to the house of a white man to dispose of some of it, leaving the squaw to take care of the rest till his return. She sat carelessly upon a log

with his hunting-knife in her hand, when she heard the breaking of branches near her, and turning round, beheld a great bear only a few paces from her.

“It was too late to retreat: and seeing that the animal was very hungry, and determined to come to close quarters, she rose, and placed her back against a small tree, holding her knife close to her breast, and in a straight line with the bear. The shaggy monster came on. She remained motionless, her eyes steadily fixed upon her enemy, and as his huge arms closed round her, she slowly drove the knife into his heart. The bear uttered a hideous cry, and sank dead at her feet. When the Indian returned, he found the courageous woman quietly taking the skin from the carcass of the formidable brute.”—Vol. ii. p. 33.

With one more *bear* anecdote we must conclude:—

“We had been some days without meat, when Moodie came running in for his gun. A great she-bear was in the wheat-field at the edge of the wood, very busily employed in helping to harvest the crop. There was but one bullet, and a charge or two of buck-shot, in the house; but Moodie started to the wood with the single bullet in his gun. . . . Old Jenny was busy at the wash-tub, but the moment she saw her master running up the clearing, and knew the cause, she left her tub and snatching up the carving-knife, ran after him, that in case the bear should have the best of the fight, she would be there to help ‘the masther.’ Finding her shoes incommode her, she flung them off, in order to run the faster. A few minutes after, came the report of the gun, and I heard Moodie halloo to E——, who was cutting stakes in the wood. I hardly thought it possible that he could have killed the bear, but I ran to the door to listen. The children were all excitement, which the sight of the black monster, borne down the clearing upon two poles, increased to the wildest demonstrations of joy. Moodie and John were carrying the prize, and old Jenny, brandishing her carving-knife, followed in the rear. . . .

“The bear was determined to have something in return for the loss of his wife. Several nights after this, our slumbers were disturbed, about midnight, by an awful yell, and old Jenny shook violently at our chamber door.

“‘Masther, masther dear!—Get up wid you this moment, or the bear will destroy the catle intirely.’

“Half asleep, Moodie sprang from his bed, seized his gun, and ran out. I threw my large cloak round me, struck a light, and followed him to the door. The moment the latter was unclosed, some calves we were rearing rushed into the kitchen, closely followed by the larger beasts, who came bellowing headlong down the hill, pursued by the bear.

“It was a laughable scene, as shown by that paltry tallow-candle. Moodie in his night shirt, taking aim at something in the darkness, surrounded by the terrified animals; old Jenny, with a large knife

in her hand, holding on to the white skirts of her master's garment, making outcry loud enough to frighten away all the wild beasts in the bush—herself almost in a state of nudity.

“ ‘ Och, maisther dear ! don't timpt the ill-conditioned crathur wid charging too near ; think of the wife and the childher. Let me come at the rampaging baste, an' I'll stick the knife into the heart of him ! ’

“ Moodie fired. The bear retreated up the clearing, with a low growl. Moodie and Jenny pursued him some way, but it was too dark to discern any object at a distance. I, for my part, stood at the open door, laughing till the tears ran down my cheeks, at the glaring eyes of the oxen, their ears erect, and their tails carried gracefully on a level with their backs, as they stared at me and the light in blank astonishment. The noise of the gun had just roused John E—— from his slumbers. He was no less amused than myself, until he saw a fine yearling heifer was bleeding, and found upon examination, that the poor animal was dangerously, if not mortally wounded. . . .

“ Moodie and Jenny now returned from the pursuit of the bear. E—— fastened all the cattle into the back-yard, close to the house. By daylight he and Moodie had started in chase of bruin, whom they tracked by his blood some way in the bush ; but here he entirely escaped their search.”—Vol. ii. pp. 176—181.

ART. IX.—*A Bill to enable Her Majesty further to regulate the Duties of Ecclesiastical Persons, and to make better Provisions for the Management and Distribution of Episcopal and Capitular Revenues. (Prepared and brought in by the Marquis of Blandford and Lord Robert Grosvenor.) Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 29th April, 1852.*

THE peculiar circumstances attendant on the session of Parliament this year, have afforded no opportunity for carrying through any measures of such a description as that which the Marquis of Blandford introduced in the course of the spring, in relation to episcopal and capitular revenues; but the mode in which his Bill was received in the House of Commons, seems to render it not improbable that its leading provisions may ere long be embodied in our statutes. It is, indeed, rather difficult to estimate what course may be taken in the next session of Parliament by those who applauded the measure on April 29. We may, perhaps, anticipate opposition to it from the Roman Catholic party in the House of Commons, and we feel assured that if it ever reaches the House of Lords in its present state, it will be modified there. But our hope and expectation is, that when this measure is again introduced, as we earnestly hope it will be, it will have been so carefully reconsidered, as to be divested of certain matters which render it liable to objection.

In offering some remarks on the Bill before us, chiefly of a practical nature, we would, in the first place, tender our heartfelt thanks to the Marquis of Blandford and to Lord Robert Grosvenor for the preparation and introduction of a measure evincing so warm an interest in the welfare of the Church of England, and comprising so much of valuable suggestion and excellent intention. We trust that we may rely on the continuance of the interest which these noble lords have so worthily shown, and on their perseverance in the cause which they have so generously undertaken to advocate. Holding perhaps different views, in some respects, from those noble lords, and from the Earl of Shaftesbury, to whom this cause is perhaps equally indebted, we rejoice to be enabled to offer to them our humble tribute of gratitude for their exertions on behalf of the Church of England; and we would state that, as far as our experience has gone, the clergy appear to be thankful for the introduction of Lord Blandford's Bill, and favourable to its leading provisions, with some exceptions.

We fully anticipated when Lord Blandford last year intimated his intention of proposing such a measure as that now before us, that in some quarters he would be met *in limine* by the objection, that no measure of the kind ought to be introduced without having been previously submitted to the clergy in convocation. We said last year, in expectation of such an objection being raised, that we trusted that legislation, good in itself, would not be opposed, merely because it had not been submitted to convocation. Without doubt it is most highly desirable, that convocation should be revived, and reformed, and made a really national body, and should be in full and satisfactory working order, and well qualified to enter on the discussion of all subjects affecting the Church, in a spirit of unity and concord, and with an enlightened piety. All this is most desirable: but is it really meant by those who object to Lord Blandford's Bill because it has not been submitted to convocation, that *all* legislation in regard to the Church—that all important measures affecting the Church, such as the creation of bishoprics, is to be arrested until convocation is in working order? Is nothing to be done for the Church in the mean time? On this principle the erection of colonial sees should be protested against, until a synod decides whether it be advisable or no. The whole legislation of the Church for the last hundred and thirty years must in that case have been wrong. There was no authority to establish sees at Ripon or Manchester, nor at Calcutta, Sydney, New Zealand, or Cape Town. We should have been bound to protest against these measures, or any similar measures. Now we say that this is really a most provoking instance of good principles and intentions taking up a false position. By all means let us get convocation, first overcoming the objections of many members of the Church of England to it; but do not let us refuse to allow measures in themselves *good* to pass, merely because we have not *yet* obtained convocation.

We sincerely hope and trust the time may not be remote when such a convocation or synod, as will be generally admitted to be adapted to the wants of the Church of England, will be in operation; but as the period of its actual attainment is very uncertain, it seems most unadvisable to reject in the mean time all legislation in favour of the Church.

Having thus alluded to the objections somewhat unreasonably raised in some quarters against any Bill for Church Extension, no matter from whom it proceeds, we would in the next place examine the Bill itself, and endeavour to see what its actual effects and working would be.

The preamble of the Bill, as usual in Parliamentary enact-

ments, recites the previous Acts of Parliament and Orders in Council bearing on the subject, and some of which it is proposed to modify.

The first clause of the Bill is one of the highest importance : it is in the following terms :—

“ That except as hereinafter provided, on the avoidance of the office of dean of any cathedral or collegiate Church in England or Wales, no other dean shall be appointed or elected to such vacancy, but the bishop of the diocese wherein such cathedral or collegiate church may, at the time of such avoidance, be situate, shall become dean thereof in virtue of his office, and by the provisions of this Act, without any further appointment or other form of proceeding, and such bishop and his successors shall be styled bishop and dean of such diocese, and, subject to the provisions of this Act, shall be entitled to all the rights and privileges of the dean of such cathedral or collegiate church, and shall be the head of the chapter, and take precedence of all other members of such chapter, and shall take such part in the duties of such cathedral or collegiate church as are prescribed for the dean in the statutes thereof, and as are not inconsistent with his office of bishop, or as shall be otherwise directed in any amendment of such statutes made in pursuance of this Act.”

The readers of this Review will remember that some years since we suggested this very union of the office of dean and bishop, with a view to provide funds for an increase in the number of bishops. We are of opinion still that there is much to recommend the notion, and we are inclined to think that the main purpose of that plan will be adopted. The suggestion which we made on this matter proceeded on the principle of reverting from the *mediæval* system on which chapters were for the most part founded, and which recognized a collegiate life essentially monastic in its character, and severed from the cure of souls, to the primitive system, according to which the bishop was the only head of the clergy of his cathedral church, and these clergy all had the cure of souls in the cathedral city. Such was the *idea* involved in our suggestion, in accordance with which we made the bishop the dean of his own cathedral, and annexed the canonries to poorly-endowed parishes *in the cathedral city* as far as possible. We still venture to think, that the latter part of this plan has its recommendations, in securing the residence of canons in the cathedral city ; in providing for the efficient service of parishes which are now, perhaps, assigned to minor canons, or to persons of less influence than might fairly be expected from members of the chapters. And, we presume, that the combination of canonries with small or moderately-endowed city livings, would ensure the appointment of tolerably-paid and efficient

curates. On this subject we shall have some suggestions to offer when we come to Clause XII.

But now to revert to the proposed annexation of the deanery to the bishopric. We must confess that, although our view remains unaltered as to the abstract propriety of such an annexation, its accordance with precedent, and with the general discipline of the Church, and its expediency in various respects, we yet think that the proposal has not, as yet, assumed such a shape as would be altogether satisfactory to the clergy, or would obviate strong opposition. As it stands at present it will be deemed too great an innovation; as amounting, in fact, to the extinction of an honourable office which has existed for many ages in the Church of England, and which has been held by many of our most eminent divines. It will be argued, that the fabrics of the cathedrals, and the efficiency of the celebration of Divine Service, will probably be impaired by the proposed alteration, because the bishop will necessarily be absent frequently from the cathedral city; and it has been remarked that the present Bill, which annexes the deanery to the bishopric, recognizes a defect in that arrangement by authorizing the appointment of a deputy, who will act as dean. So that by the very same Bill which extinguishes the deaneries they are created again under a different title in certain circumstances. We must remember also, that deaneries are in the patronage of the Crown, and that the ministers of the Crown, and those who have held office, may not be inclined to favour the virtual extinction of an honourable office, which holds a certain rank and dignity, unless it should be clearly proved that an evident necessity exists for so doing.

Now, the only grounds for suppressing the office of dean by annexing it to the bishopric, is, that it is a *sinecure*, and *the endowment is wanted* for the purpose of endowing offices which are not sinecures, as bishoprics and poor livings. But it may certainly be replied to this, that the same objects may be attained without the suppression of deaneries. In the first place, with regard to the provision for additional bishops, the Bill proposes a reduction in the incomes of existing sees, which actually provides 30,000*l.* out of 40,000*l.*, the estimated incomes of the new sees. The remaining 10,000*l.* is not a very large sum, and might be easily provided without any sweeping extinction of deaneries. The deaneries of Westminster, of Windsor, and of Bristol, if annexed to their sees (which we think they might be), would provide 4000*l.* We conceive that the deaneries of Durham and of Christ Church might be reduced by one-half; that the deanery of St. Paul's might be held with the see of St. Alban's; that the deans of Wells and Lichfield, and any others exceeding the

scale of 1000*l.*, might be reduced to that sum. These alterations would about make up the income of 10,000*l.*, required for the endowment of additional sees, without suppressing deaneries generally. And, on the whole, we think that such a course of proceeding would meet the wishes of the members of the Church of England, and be more in accordance, even as far as we can judge, with the wishes of statesmen of all parties, than the proposal to suppress deaneries. We would add, that if additional funds were required for the endowment of sees, they might be provided by equalizing the number of canons in each cathedral; for, by the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenues Bill, in 1840, while the greater number of chapters were limited to four canons each, the chapter of Christ Church, Oxford, is to comprise eight, Canterbury six, Durham six, Westminster six, Winchester five, and Exeter five. Now we are not aware of any reason why two canonries should not be suspended at Christ Church, Oxford, two at Durham, two at Westminster, and one each at Winchester and Exeter, which would produce a further income of 8000*l.* towards the endowment of bishoprics, and would merely place the chapters of these cathedrals in the same position as others, of which they could not fairly complain. We hold that in this way the income of the new sees contemplated might be made 3000*l.* instead of 2500*l.*; and this will, we think, be generally deemed an improvement in the plan.

And now with regard to the other argument which is employed for the suppression of deaneries,—we mean their *sinecure character*. We have to say, that without doubt the present duties of deans are of such a nature, that they may be described, in a general way, as sinecures; *i. e.* the attendance at Divine Service, and occasionally preaching, and superintending the fabric of the church, are certainly no very onerous duties in themselves; and are such duties as the clergy in general undertake, in addition to the actual and regular *administration* of the sacraments and services of the Church, visiting the sick, the cure of souls, and all the incidents of parochial duty. Of course, in comparison with the position of any common parish priest, the duties of a dean, however important and dignified in their character, are nothing in point of actual labour of body and mind. But surely it need not be so; for there can be no difficulty in attaching to the office of dean such an amount of spiritual, pastoral, ecclesiastical, or educational duties, as shall make him one of the most laborious ministers of the Church, instead of holding a sinecure.

If this be the case, we must say that we are unable to see sufficient grounds for annexing the office of dean to that of bishop, in opposition to the feelings and wishes of an influential portion

of the members of the Church of England. We feel ourselves bound to state this, because we formerly recommended this very step ; but we were led to do so, solely with a view to the endowment of additional sees ; and if sufficient funds can be provided otherwise, and if, as there is reason to believe, such a proposal would be unsatisfactory to many of the heads of the Church, and would not be without practical inconveniences, we should say that the case is very materially altered ; and we should now urge the preservation of the office, but its association with duties of an important and even arduous character.

What those duties might be, we will examine when we come to consider the general question of chapters in connexion with Clause XII. of this Bill.

CLAUSE II. provides that the bishop-dean shall not be obliged to *reside* for eight months in the year in his capacity of dean, which all deans are now required to do. Of course this clause is rendered necessary by the first ; but there is an apparent inconvenience in thus being obliged to relax the rules of *residence* in any case ; and the cathedrals are thus, *primâ facie*, at once deprived, in some degree, of the advantage of a resident head, which they now possess by virtue of recent legislation.

CLAUSE III. provides that the endowments of the deanery, annexed to the bishopric, shall vest in the ecclesiastical commissioners, and form part of their endowment ; and directs that the deanery-house shall, "*unless there be already a suitable episcopal residence in such cathedral city,*" become the episcopal residence. This latter part of the clause we consider highly valuable ; and we hope it may be retained, with some exceptions. The sees of Canterbury, York, Carlisle, St. David's, Durham, Gloucester, Lichfield, Manchester, Oxford, Rochester, Winchester, and Worcester, are at present without episcopal residences at the cathedral city. We conceive that, in all these cases, except two or three, the deanery-house should be made the episcopal residence, and the dean placed in one of the residentiary houses, or any other fitting house, belonging to the chapter, and in the vicinity of the cathedral, or such a house should be purchased for the dean.

CLAUSE IV. gives to the bishop the power of appointing a deputy, who in his absence is to hold and exercise all the powers of dean. So that the *office* of dean is really called into existence again, and is to exist in the absence of the bishop, which may possibly be for the greater part of the year. This clause would be unnecessary, if the deaneries were to be retained, as we propose.

CLAUSE V. directs, that upon the next avoidance of any

deanery, and its junction with the bishopric, a chapter shall be summoned, and the statutes of the cathedral shall be revised and amended by the bishop and chapter; and certain further directions are given for submitting these revised statutes to the ecclesiastical commissioners, and to the Queen in council, and for considering the remarks and observations to be made on them.

We think this a valuable and useful suggestion, and it ought to form part of any measure brought forward for the improvement of cathedral institutions. It would be very desirable to have duties and privileges distinctly defined, when any material change is made; and doubtless there are various portions of the old statutes of cathedrals which would be altogether unsuited to existing circumstances.

CLAUSE VI. has relation to the provision for educational purposes in connexion with cathedrals. Public attention has been much directed of late to the cathedral schools, and the endowments provided for them. It would, we think, be highly advisable that the purposes of founders should, in reference to this subject, be carried out in a liberal spirit. The fact that in every cathedral church a certain number of boys—the children of poor clergy, or of other persons in small circumstances—were gratuitously (or nearly so) maintained and educated; and that a free education, or at a very moderate charge, was provided for others, would, we think, not merely be a great benefit in itself, a positive boon to the middle classes of the country, a valuable contribution to the provision for education amongst those classes, but we think that the gratuitous education and support of students in thirty chapter schools would be a sort of practical tangible benefit that would be adapted to the comprehension and feelings of the public in these days, and would be in accordance with its views, both educational and financial. We should be glad to see a canonry in every cathedral connected with the office of master of the diocesan school, and the minor canonries with duties as under-masters; and we should be glad to see the funds now employed in paying masters, applied towards the maintenance of pupils. We do not see why those chapter schools should not impart the elementary knowledge which would qualify young men either to enter at the universities, or at pastoral colleges.

CLAUSE VII. This clause gives instructions as to the nature of the changes to be made in the statutes of cathedrals. These instructions have reference, in particular, to the re-arrangement of duties which would be requisite in consequence of the union of the office of bishop and dean; and so far we have no remark to make on them, except that we do not expect that such an

alteration will be found requisite. In other respects, the revision of the statutes, as proposed, seems very desirable.

CLAUSE VIII. This clause directs that the number of minor canons be reduced to two, and that their stipend shall not exceed 250*l.* yearly. We conceive that if this regulation be made, it would be desirable to make some provision for cases in which minor canons might be in bad health or superannuated. It is not uncommon to see old minor canons who are unequal to their duty, and who are extremely inefficient. Should there not therefore be some power to provide substitutes in such a case, or to superannuate minor canons on retiring pensions? If there are to be a small number of minor canons, and if the maintenance of the choral service is to depend chiefly on them, and if they are also to take active duties in connexion with education, it is indispensable that they should be *efficient*, and that when inefficient, there should be a power to remove them.

CLAUSE IX. This clause gives power to alter the statutes of any chapter at once when necessary. On this clause we have no further remark to make, except that we entirely coincide in the desirableness of some such power of revision being vested somewhere, and exercised.

CLAUSE X., merely refers to the signing and sealing of the amended statutes, and the legal formalities which render them authentic. This is merely a matter of form.

CLAUSE XI. The clause now before us is of considerable importance. It is as follows:—

“Notwithstanding any thing contained in the said recited Acts or any of them, no canon residentiary or minor canon hereafter to be appointed, under the provisions of this Act, in any cathedral or collegiate church, shall be allowed to take or hold, together with his canonry or minor canonry, any benefice or any spiritual office connected with the cure of souls.”

We are aware of the great inconvenience which this clause is intended to remedy. It has been hitherto customary for minor canons and canons residentiary to hold benefices at a distance from the cathedral, so that the minor canons and the residentiaries have been absent for the greater part of the year from the cathedral city; and out of four or six minor canons, and several canons residentiary, there has been, perhaps, not above one or two of the former, and one of the latter, present at any time in the cathedral. The system of plurality and non-residence was no where more glaring in its manifestations. It was also remarked that the canonries residentiary, which are themselves generally quite sufficient for the support of a clergyman, were almost invariably held with those parochial benefices which were *best*

endowed; thus conveying to the public mind the impression of a grasping and covetous spirit. The suppression of this system has become essential, and should the clause before us be carried, even though we may think that it goes rather further than is necessary, we shall rejoice. The object is, to bring canons *residential* into *residence*;—surely, a most reasonable object. This is, indeed, a reform which merits its title.

At the same time we would say, that the clause as it stands appears to be scarcely reconcilable with a subsequent clause (Clause XIII.), in which it is directed that no canonries be suspended “now annexed or *hereafter to be annexed . . . to any benefice or spiritual office connected with the cure of souls*,” for the latter clause authorizes the very thing which is forbidden by Clause XI. In fact, we know that two of the canonries of Westminster are united, and very properly, with cure of souls. We have never heard any objection to this arrangement; and we certainly do not see why the same arrangement should not be permissible in other cases. We concede the great desirableness of making the canons, or some of them, *resident* at the cathedral city. We admit that they should not be permitted to hold wealthy benefices in addition to their canonries: but we must say, that if canons are to be brought into residence, they ought to be given duties of such a description that they cannot be reproached as sinecurists; and we add, that the part they would take in the Cathedral service alone would not be sufficient for this purpose; and if it be advisable to connect canonries with archdeaconries, professorships, masterships of colleges, or the office of inspecting schools, it does seem that there can be no sufficient reason why they should not also, in some cases, be connected with the cure of souls in the cathedral city. Assuredly, it cannot be meant, that a canon should be excluded from the cure of souls—the very most important of all ministerial duties, and the especial object of the ministry—and this, too, at a time when the insufficient endowment of many important parishes in cathedral cities is a matter of general notoriety. We should, therefore, suggest that the eleventh clause ought to have the following addition placed at the end of it:—

“Unless the said benefice or spiritual office be within the city or town wherein the said cathedral or collegiate church is situate, and do not exceed the net value of three hundred pounds per annum.”

We would add a provision, that any such benefice might be prospectively, and permanently united to any such canonry, and that in case no such benefice could be found in the cathedral city, it might be lawful to annex to such canonry any parochial bene-

fice in any populous place within the diocese, where the population of the parish shall exceed 2000, or the net income be less than 300*l*.

CLAUSE XII. We now come to another very important clause, directing the further limitation of the number of canons residentiary. It is as follows:—

“And whereas it is expedient that the number of canons residentiary attached or to be attached to any cathedral or collegiate church in England or Wales should be further limited: Be it enacted, That after the *passing of this Act*, upon the avoidance of any canonry or canonries (other than such as are hereinafter excepted), such canonry or canonries shall be suspended, any thing contained in the said secondly-recited Act to the contrary notwithstanding, until the number of such canonries be reduced to two, which two canonries shall for all the purposes of this Act be construed to be those held and to be held by the two canons residentiary limited by this Act, and shall upon the next and every subsequent avoidance thereof be filled up in the manner heretofore customable, and the canons for the time being holding the same shall be styled canons residentiary, and shall reside in the cathedral town, or within three miles therefrom, and shall be subject to the provisions of this Act; and all the profits and emoluments of each and every canonry suspended under and by virtue of this Act shall immediately upon and from the suspension thereof be paid to and vest in the ecclesiastical commissioners for England, in the manner provided by the said secondly-recited Act for any canonry suspended by and under the provisions of the said Act, and form part of their common fund.”

This clause, then, provides for the retention of two canons residentiary, who are to be in residence for eight months in the year; and as at present four canons are each obliged only to keep four months' residence, the cathedrals are apparently left in very much the same position by this clause as at present, as regards the residence of canons.

Moreover, in the next clause (XIII.) all canonries which are now or “*hereafter*” annexed to archdeaconries, professorships, benefices, with cure of souls, or certain headships of colleges, are to *remain*. At present we think there are twenty-two canonries thus connected, and the clause even gives the power of increasing the number indefinitely; but, as it appears to us, the nineteenth clause *releases* all such canons from the obligations of residence at the cathedral by which they are at present bound. So that the Act leaves a great number of canonries, besides the two residentiary canonries in each cathedral, and apparently in opposition to its own principle in making some canons resident, relieves others from all necessity of residing. We think this does not

hang well together, and suggests the idea of the Bill having been amended by some one who did not thoroughly enter into the ideas which suggested it.

We would observe, on this clause, that there seems no reason why, if two canons are to become permanently resident, all others should be released from the obligations they are now under. It is possible that one or other of the *two* canons might be indisposed, or absent. Would it not be desirable, merely with a view to the efficiency of Divine Service, that the other canonries retained by Clause XIII. should still contribute the aid they now do towards the service of the cathedral? But another question remains to be considered. Is it necessary or desirable to suspend any more of the canonries, or to reduce cathedrals to two canons each? A strong case should be made out before so great a change is introduced. It should be proved that there is an evident reason for altering the law which only a few years since reduced so greatly the number of canonries, and to which, even then, so strong an objection was taken by many members of the Church of England. That law reduced the number of canons very materially, and left the smallest number that can well be supposed to constitute a chapter. We readily allow that these endowments ought to be made to contribute much more than they do to the general welfare of the Church. We admit that their funds ought to be made available, to a great extent, for the relief of the spiritual destitution now existing. But we do not think that this is the precise mode in which it ought to be effected; because it would weaken the cathedral bodies, and injure them, without any corresponding benefit to the Church at large. Now be it remembered that, by the Bill now before us, *two* canonries in each cathedral are set apart for strictly cathedral purposes; and certain other canonries are preserved, making in the whole eighty-two canonries retained, out of 126, or thereabouts. Thus the real gain for the purpose of endowing poor or new benefices would be the income of about forty-four canonries, amounting to about 22,000*l.* per annum. Now we submit, that if this amount is made fairly available for spiritual purposes in the way of endowing poor livings, as much good would be done as if it were absorbed by the ecclesiastical commissioners; and surely this might be very easily provided for. The Bill enacts that two canons shall become resident, in future, for eight months in the year each. This is an excellent provision. Let the other canons residentiary in each cathedral be still liable to their existing term of residence; but let their canonries be annexed, at the next vacancy, to

parishes of small income and large population in the cathedral city, if possible ; if not, in some other town or important place in the diocese, as we have suggested above. We believe that, if such a course were adopted, all parties would be tolerably well satisfied. The cathedrals would retain their fair establishment, and would be placed in a state of greater efficiency than they now are. Many important parishes would be materially benefited by an improvement in their endowments. And the canonries would be no longer sinecures, nor held with rich benefices, so that Church reformers would be satisfied.

It will be seen, therefore, that we wish to retain this clause, so far as it provides for two canons being resident for eight months in the year, but to omit that part which suspends the remaining canonries. One of these residentiary canons we would make master of the cathedral school. The other we would make either master of the diocesan training college for schoolmasters, or diocesan inspector of schools, or principal or professor in a diocesan college for the instruction of candidates for holy orders, or chaplain to an infirmary, or penitentiary, or hospital, or holder of any similar office which should be annexed to the canonry by the ecclesiastical commissioners. And we would here add, as to the duties of deans, that we would either attach to the office some parish in the cathedral city not exceeding 300*l.* income, or else some one or other of the various offices to which we have referred above. And we would go further than this : we would introduce a clause directing the ecclesiastical commissioners to obtain from each bishop a return of the offices and benefices which it would be desirable to annex prospectively to every deanery, and canonry, and minor canonry, and to annex them accordingly ; reserving, however, to the commissioners the power to make alterations hereafter. This would look as if there was an intention of carrying out the scheme with vigour.

There is one consideration which appears to have been not taken into account on the introduction of this Bill. The public have been assured by Lord Shaftesbury, and other persons of weight and authority, that an improved system of managing Church property will largely augment its value ; and that from this source funds may be derived which would, to a great extent, meet the existing spiritual wants of the country. If we remember aright, Lord Shaftesbury stated, when Lord Ashley, in the House of Commons, that 600 churches are now requisite, and that funds would arise from the improved management of that property to endow these churches with 300*l.* yearly each. If this be the case, there can be no necessity to extinguish any of these canon-

ries, more especially if such a course as we have indicated should be adopted, by which the incomes of all canonries would be applied to purposes of obvious and undeniable utility.

CLAUSE XIII. We have already adverted to this clause: it merely provides that certain canonries there described shall *not* be suspended.

CLAUSE XIV. This clause directs that every canon and minor canon hereafter to be appointed shall reside for at least eight months in the year, but if any canon be an archdeacon or a diocesan inspector of schools, the time during which he is engaged in the actual duties of his office shall be accounted *residence*. There is here evidently some mistake, for by Clause XIX. archdeacons are not bound to keep *any residence* as canons. We should think it altogether unnecessary to make any provision in Clause XIV. with reference to the residence of archdeacons or inspectors of schools. By the existing law they would only be required to reside for four months at the cathedral, and surely eight months are enough for the discharge of their respective offices.

CLAUSE XV. authorizes the appointment of substitutes to perform duties which are unprovided for in consequence of the suspension of canonries. This clause would, we conceive, be unnecessary, if the number of canons were to remain as it is; but it might be necessary if any small reduction should occur, such as we suggested under Clause I.

CLAUSE XVI. The object of this clause is not apparent at first: it is conceived in the following terms:—

“With respect to any canonry or canonries already suspended by the provisions of the said secondly-recited Act, or which may hereafter be suspended under the provisions of the same Act or this Act, it shall be lawful for the ecclesiastical commissioners, as soon as conveniently may be after the passing of this Act, or after such suspension shall have taken place, as the case may be, to remove the suspension from and to re-establish any such canonry in manner provided by the said secondly-recited Act for removing the suspension from any canonry suspended under the same Act, by annexing thereto any suitable benefice, such benefice being a rectory with a cure of souls, a vicarage, or a perpetual curacy, now or then in the patronage of the chapter to which such canonry may belong, or of any ecclesiastical corporation, sole or aggregate, or of any other patron, with the consent of such patron, and where the bishop is patron, with the consent of the archbishop; and such canonry shall be in the direct patronage of the bishop of the diocese in which such chapter is situate, who shall upon the then present and every subsequent vacancy thereof collate thereto a spiritual person, who shall thereupon be entitled to installation as a canon of the church to which he shall be so collated: provided always, that where any benefice

or other preferment so to be annexed shall happen to be in the patronage of Her Majesty, or the Lord Chancellor, or the Chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, the right of nomination and appointment to such canonry shall vest in Her Majesty, who, upon the then existing and every subsequent vacancy thereof, shall and may appoint by letters patent a spiritual person to be canon, who shall thereupon be entitled to installation as a canon of the church to which he may be so appointed: provided always, that nothing contained in this Act shall be held to affect the provisions of the secondly-recited Act respecting the collegiate churches of Wolverhampton, Middleham, and Heytesbury."

The only object of this clause, that we can see, and of the next clause, empowering the ecclesiastical commissioners to increase the number of canonries to twelve by endowing them with parochial benefices, is to provide the materials for a tribunal actually constituted by Clause XIV. for the preliminary trial of clergy charged with offences against the ecclesiastical laws. We would here remark, that if any such tribunal be desirable, on which we are scarcely prepared to offer an opinion, there would seem to be little necessity for so complicated a course of proceeding in restoring suspended canonries and annexing them to parochial benefices, thus, in fact, creating a new body of canons non-residentiary, when it is remembered that in all the cathedrals of the older foundation there is already a body of canons non-residentiary, sometimes called prebendaries, who could be at once available for any such tribunal; and the honorary canons in the cathedrals of the new foundation would answer the same purpose. But we really see no decided practical advantage over the existing system which should lead to a change in the law. We do not see any probability that a chapter consisting of five or more individuals, as proposed by this Bill, would be a better tribunal for the purpose than a commission as directed by the present law.

CLAUSE XIX. This clause appears to be introduced somewhat out of its natural place, which would be after Clause XIV., with which, however, it appears to be somewhat inconsistent, as it puts an end to the necessity of residence in the case of some whom the former clause only partially exempts.

CLAUSES XXI., XXII., provide for the creation of canonries at Durham and Christ Church, Oxford, as endowments for the offices at present held by the deans. We cannot suppose that either of these clauses will be adopted; and they are only rendered necessary by the proposed junction of the offices of dean and bishop, which, we think, would not, in these particular cases at least, be consented to.

CLAUSES XXIII., XXIV., XXV., XXVI. and XXVII., provide for the restoration of the see of Westminster, one of the

six sees created by King Henry VIII. ; and also for the restoration of the separate and independent sees of Gloucester and Bristol. These clauses do not appear to call for any particular observation, except in one point. The appointment of bishops to those sees in which chapters exist, by royal patent, and without the election of the chapter, is a deviation from the uniform practice prescribed by law in the case of all episcopal appointments in England ; and we see no particular benefit or advantage to be gained by making this exception. Let all the bishops be appointed either by patent or in the present mode, as may be judged most advisable ; but let us not make an exceptional difference in the mode of appointment without some special reason. Considerable objections have been made to this alteration, and to the provision in Clause XXX., by which all bishops of new sees are to be nominated by letters patent ; and it is not desirable unnecessarily to run counter to men's opinions. We could understand the appointment of bishops by letters patent, if there were no chapters ; but this Bill actually takes the trouble to create a chapter for every new see, and yet withdraws from the new chapters the right which they would possess, by the law of the land, to elect their bishops. We own we do not see any sufficient reason for this. The election and mode of appointment of bishops is a grave and important question in itself, but it is so important that the wiser course would seem to be not to raise the question in connexion with such a Bill as that before us, in which it is desirable to secure unanimity as far as possible.

CLAUSES XXVIII., XXIX., and XXX. provide, and, as it appears to us, very completely and succinctly, for the erection of new dioceses. It seems that the divisions of dioceses is only to take place when requisitions to that effect have been made to the ecclesiastical commissioners, who are to lay such requisition before the Queen in council, and, on the next avoidance of the diocese, to prepare a scheme for its division. We should say, that a provision might here be advantageously introduced to the effect that such a scheme might be prepared and take effect at any time before the next avoidance of a diocese, *with consent of the bishop*. But we have a remark of some importance to make here. *The Act does not actually provide for the erection of more than two sees*, it merely gives power to erect others. We think this a serious defect ; because there is nothing on the face of the Bill to ensure the appointment of as many bishops as are now proposed, and on the other hand there is nothing to prevent the number from being increased beyond what is now proposed ; and this ought not to be. We think the new dioceses ought to be mentioned by name ; and, as every one is prepared and assents to the proposal of seventeen new sees, we would insert their names thus, *e.g.*

1. Hexham and Newcastle ; 2. Beverley ; 3. Liverpool ; 4. Southwell and Nottingham ; 5. Derby ; 6. Birmingham and Coventry ; 7. Leeds ; 8. Northampton ; 9. St. Edmondsbury ; 10. St. Albans ; 11. Windsor ; 12. Westminster and Southwark ; 13. Bristol and Bath ; 14. Plymouth and St. Germans ; 15. Sherborne ; 16. Brecon ; 17. Shrewsbury. We would suggest also that there seems to be no particular necessity to wait for requisitions to divide any diocese. All that seems necessary is to obtain the sanction and concurrence of the bishop to the present or prospective division of his see ; if that be not attainable, the arrangement should stand over till the next avoidance of the see.

CLAUSE XXXI., which directs that the number of spiritual peers shall not be increased, and that the sees of Gloucester, Bristol, and Westminster shall be the only sees, in addition to the others now existing, which shall succeed to parliamentary seats, is, in our opinion, an excellent provision. We believe the principle of appointing additional bishops without parliamentary seats is, at length, admitted to be a safe one. The offer of Lord John Russell of four sees without parliamentary seats (which was never fulfilled) was *accepted* by the hierarchy. This clause is requisite, because, if the number of spiritual peers is not to be increased, and if all the new bishops are to succeed in turn to seats in parliament, the result will be that all the bishops in parliament will be old men, and therefore less equal to the duties of parliament, in addition to those of their dioceses.

CLAUSES XXXII., XXXIII., XXXIV., XXXV., and XXXVI. relate to the constitution of chapters, and the framing of statutes for their government in all the new dioceses. They create two canons residentiary for each new cathedral, and ten other canons, attaching the title and dignity of canon to that number of parochial benefices. They also create two minor canons ; but we see no funds provided for the maintenance of a choir. Now, if there be no choral service, *i. e.* if the service is not to be conducted in regular cathedral style, we own that it does not seem to us very clear why two canons residentiary and two minor canons should be appointed. Nor are we perfectly clear that it would be advisable to introduce full cathedral service into churches hitherto parochial, where the congregations had never been accustomed to any thing of the kind. We should say, therefore, that while it would be requisite to constitute a chapter in each new see, which could be effected by annexing parochial benefices to the stalls and to the deanery, the appointment of residentiaries, minor canons, and a choir might be left open to the judgment of the ecclesiastical commissioners ; and that expense might be either saved, or else provided for by voluntary contributions and endowments. In fact, to carry out this

part of the plan would involve a cost of something like 50,000*l.* per annum, which is an expense not to be undertaken without consideration, and which would more than swallow up any funds gained by the suspension of canonries in the existing cathedrals. With reference, then, to the constitution of cathedral churches for the new sees, we should conceive that a preferable course would be to make nothing compulsory, except the establishment of a chapter consisting of a non-residentiary dean and canons in the manner proposed, and to give power to the ecclesiastical commissioners to establish residentiaries, minor canons, and a choir, if they should deem it advisable.

CLAUSES XXXVII., XXXVIII. By these clauses the whole of the chapter property is taken out of their possession, and vested absolutely in the ecclesiastical commissioners, who on their part are bound to pay a fixed income to each dean and canon; calculated on their average receipts for some years; and by a subsequent clause (XLVIII.) they are also bound to pay the other officers of the cathedral, and maintain Divine Service, and keep the cathedral in repair.

Now on this clause we should think there will be much difference of opinion. It is, indeed, evident that the present system of management is productive of serious inconvenience to deans and canons. Their incomes arise chiefly from the payment of fines by their tenants on the renewal of leases; but these payments being optional are so uncertain, that the income of a member of a chapter may be for years so small, as to produce material inconvenience, and may then become for a time very large.

We do not enter into any other questions with regard to the management and improvement of this property, but limit ourselves to this admitted and serious inconvenience. Still it seems hardly necessary to deprive the chapters of their property, in order to obtain fixed incomes, and an improved system of management. We observe that by this Bill the fee of episcopal property is still vested in the bishops, though its management is transferred to the ecclesiastical commissioners, who are however, by Clause XLII., prevented from alienating any part of the property without consent of the bishop. We cannot see why a similar provision should not be made in the case of chapters. Those corporations are as ancient as any others in the kingdom. They hold possessions by the gift of the Crown, and of the nobles and prelates of England in ancient times. They have sent representatives to the convocation from times when it was a branch of the Parliament of England. They have been powerful and opulent corporations; and have been most materially reduced in

all respects. We think that it will be admitted that if chapters are placed on so moderate a scale as to excite no feelings of envy, and if they are so thoroughly reformed as to be amongst the most useful bodies of men in the community, instead of being mere sinecurists, it would be very undesirable to make them pensionaries, and to divest them wholly of the property which they have held for so many ages. As corporations they ought not to be deprived of their property without the allegation of a fault, or without a strict and evident necessity. We submit that neither one nor the other exists in this case; and we feel assured, therefore, that strong opposition would be offered to the proposal for transferring their property to the ecclesiastical commissioners.

But we think that were the management of the chapter property placed in the hands of the commissioners much benefit would arise. The incomes of the chapters would become fixed, while the ecclesiastical commissioners would be able largely to improve the value of the property, and thereby to provide further means for Church-extension. We submit that such an arrangement as this would meet the wishes of Parliamentary Church reformers who wish for an improved management of Church property by the commissioners, while it would, to a certain degree, preserve the rights of the chapters, and would evince some consideration and respect for them, which would tend to diminish the opposition which, under any circumstances, will probably be offered by some of the Church's friends to this proposal.

CLAUSE XXXIX. The object of this clause is one which deserves some attention, and we conceive it to be framed in a right spirit, though we should think it might be in some respect modified. The clause stands thus :

“ Provided always, any thing contained in the said secondly-recited Act to the contrary notwithstanding, That the payment to be made to every canon residentiary who may be hereafter appointed under the provisions of this Act for limiting the number of canons to any canonry in any cathedral or collegiate church in England, other than the cathedral churches of St. Paul's, Manchester, and Durham, and the collegiate church of Westminster, shall be *seven hundred pounds* per annum, and in the cathedral churches of St. David's and Llandaff *five hundred and fifty pounds* per annum : provided always, that if under the provisions of this Act the ecclesiastical commissioners shall assign to any such canon residentiary, or to any canon residentiary hereafter to be appointed to any canonry in the cathedral churches of St. Paul's, Manchester, and Durham, or in the collegiate church of St. Peter's, Westminster, or to any minor canon who may hereafter be appointed in any existing cathedral or collegiate church, or in any cathedral

church constituted under the provisions of this Act, any office in any grammar or middle school, training school, or pastoral college attached or to be attached to any cathedral or collegiate church, then the said ecclesiastical commissioners shall pay such sums only to every such canon residentiary or minor canon respectively as shall after due inquiry and calculation of the amount expected to accrue from such office or offices, make up, together with such fees or other emoluments, with respect to any canon residentiary in the cathedral churches of St. Paul's, Manchester, and Durham, and in the collegiate church of St. Peter's, Westminster, the annual income fixed for a canon of the said churches by the said secondly-recited Act, and with respect to every other canon residentiary and minor canon in any cathedral or collegiate church in England or Wales the annual income fixed for such canon residentiary or minor canon by this Act respectively."

It may be observed on this clause, in the first place, that it proposes to augment the incomes of such canons as it makes residentiary from 500*l.*, which is the general average under the existing law, to 700*l.*, prohibiting them at the same time from holding any office connected with the cure of souls, and directing that even if they hold any other office with their canonries, their incomes shall still not exceed 700*l.* We think 700*l.* is an income which would place a canon in some degree of comfort, and undoubtedly, considering the position which canons of a cathedral have been always accustomed to occupy, and their rank as leading clergy, it would, we think, be only fair and just, that they should not be reduced to very small and straitened means, but that they should be, in some moderate degree, at ease in their worldly circumstances. Yet we confess it seems to us questionable whether there be any necessity to augment their incomes in the way proposed. We would rather see their incomes left as they are at present; for the less interference or remodelling we have the better. But let them, as we have before suggested, have the power of holding with their canonries any parochial benefice in the cathedral city, not exceeding the net value of 300*l.*, or let them have the emoluments arising from any other office, such as the clause mentions, provided its net income or emoluments do not exceed the same amount of 300*l.*

CLAUSES XL.—XLVI., all relate to the proposed transfer of the management of the bishops' estates to the ecclesiastical commissioners. In this case, as in the case of chapter property, we see no insurmountable objection to the proposed transfer, provided the rights of the sees and of the chapters be fully and distinctly recognized by the law. When any interference of this kind takes place, the right of the owners should be most explicitly guarded and protected. We should therefore suggest, that not

merely should the commissioners be restrained from alienating any portion of the endowments of sees and chapters without consent of the bishops and chapters respectively ; but their tenure of the lands, &c., should be in the nature of a trusteeship ; and all their acts, in reference to such property, should proceed in the name of the bishop or chapter, of whom they are trustees, by act of parliament, and not merely in their own name. They should run in the name of the bishop or chapter, acting by the commissioners. We conceive that by some such course the rights of the Church might be secured, while the object of the Bill would be equally obtained.

CLAUSE XLVII., which directs that all title-deeds, and other investments of title, be handed over to the ecclesiastical commissioners, we consider decidedly objectionable on various grounds. We hold that if the fee of the property remains in the Church, the title-deeds should be retained also. We object to the removal of documents, which are of great value and antiquity, from the localities where they have a special interest, and where they constitute a part of the national records, to the custody of the ecclesiastical commissioners, who have no particular repository for such records, and where there would be a great risk that so great a mass of valuable documents might be either lost, injured, intermingled, or destroyed by fire. If such documents were to be removed, it ought only to be to some collection of records where there is ample security for papers. Until some security of this kind is provided, we do not see even a *primâ facie* ground for removing papers from the custody of the registrars of dioceses, and from chapters. We see many objections to a place of centralization, which, if it were to be efficiently carried out, would involve a very large expenditure.

CLAUSE XLVIII., which imposes on the commissioners the duty of repairing cathedrals, and keeping up Church service, does not seem to call for any particular remark, except that it is certainly a question whether it would not be better to pay the average amount expended in such matters to the chapter, and let them manage the details, and return an account of the expenditure. We think they might safely be entrusted with these details, which would also leave them in possession of the powers they have hitherto exercised, and give them the fair control over their churches they ought to have, without interference from any other body. We think it would seem as if the dean and chapter were reduced to ciphers in their own cathedrals, if they could not give orders for repairs, or pay their minor canons, singing men, choristers, vergers, and bedesmen. This should not be ; there can be no occasion for it ; and it would cause unnecessary

pain to the members of chapters, and might even diminish their fair and legitimate authority in their cathedral churches.

CLAUSE XLIX. gives power to the ecclesiastical commissioners to sell those episcopal residences which may be rendered unnecessary by the conversion of the deanery-house into an episcopal residence; and it provides that the proceeds of such sales should go into the common fund. Now we would here make a claim for the new sees. It will be observed that no provision is made in this Bill for episcopal residences for those sees; at least we have been unable to see any such. Now we would suggest that the episcopal residences to be sold under this clause, should form a fund for the purchase or erection of residences for the new sees. We are aware of the jealousy as to expense under this head, and would therefore suggest, that all risk of such an issue could be obviated by fixing a certain sum, say 5000*l.*, as the limit of the amount to be expended by the commissioners on any such episcopal residence. We do not see how such a proposal could be objected to in parliament, even by the strongest Church reformers.

CLAUSES L., LI., and the remainder of the Bill, to Clause LVIII., comprise little that calls for any particular remark. The tribunal provided in Clause LIV. we have already spoken of.

CLAUSE L., however, which directs that in all cases the ecclesiastical commissioners shall apply the surplus funds available from the lands, tithes, &c., in their possession, with a due regard to the spiritual wants of those places where these lands or tithes are situated, is a provision which only does justice to acknowledged claims of right and equity. We hope that this clause will be retained substantially, and passed into law.

Such are the remarks and observations which have occurred to us in connexion with the Marquis of Blandford's Bill. While we are engaged in this examination, we perceive, by the public journals, that the Government have resolved to introduce a Bill on the subject, and that Lord Blandford has placed the question in their hands.

We may fairly presume that the ministry will not offer any objection to the erection of new sees, more especially as we remember that the prime minister has, on more than one occasion, given expression to opinions in the House of Lords favourable to that measure. The Church of England, however, is deeply indebted to the noble lords who have introduced the Bill before us, and whose well-directed labours have contributed to place the whole question in so favourable a position. We feel, also, that gratitude is due to Her Majesty's Government for the manner in which they have taken up the subject; and we can

only say, that the pledge they have now given furnishes the strongest reason the Church of England has yet had to desire the continuance of that Government; and that should they actually bring forward and carry a measure as good as that of Lord Blandford, they will have a lasting claim on the gratitude of the Church of England.

The question, however, having assumed this position, it becomes a matter of great anxiety to ascertain what the sentiments of Government are on the great features of the Marquis of Blandford's proposal. Mr. Secretary Walpole has, in his speech on the second reading of Lord Blandford's Bill, stated that he sees no reason for the suppression of deaneries, or for the extensive reduction of canonries. He admitted the desirableness of increasing the episcopate, if funds could be provided; and while desirous to obviate the evil of making the high officers of the Church mere stipendiaries of the State, he was desirous to relieve them from the care and trouble of temporal affairs. As far as we can collect the sentiments of Government from this, they appear to be in accordance with the general spirit of the remarks which we have above offered. But we own that on one point, and that the most important of all, the constructive part of the measure—the creation of new sees—we are not without uneasiness. We say most decidedly that the one great point which presents itself in the Bill, and renders it a Bill gratifying to the Church, is the proposed increase of the episcopate. This is the object for which Churchmen have struggled and laboured for a long series of years, and in which they have been again and again disappointed and deceived. Church reformers of all sorts and kinds, dissenters, politicians, those who care nothing for the polity of the Church of England, are ready at all times to reduce the incomes of the superior clergy, to sweep away sinecures, to make all the clergy hard-working men, to provide additional churches and clergy for the people, to reform abuses, to alter statutes, and to interfere with Church property. There is a good deal of all this in Lord Blandford's Bill; it is adapted to the popular taste. But the provisions of his measure, or of any similar measure, are rendered acceptable to Churchmen by the proposal to create more bishops; not merely three or four bishops, but sixteen or seventeen. Any proposal which does not go to that extent would, we think, furnish no particular cause of gratitude to Churchmen. The existing state of chapters is not one of those things which Churchmen practically feel as a great evil. It is undoubtedly desirable to remedy the existing inconveniences, chiefly because a ground of scandal and objection should not be left to Church reform agitators. But were it not for this, there could be no very urgent

necessity for introducing great reforms in chapters ; at least, there would be no such necessity as that reform on this point would call forth any lively feelings of pleasure or gratitude in Churchmen. But an increase in the episcopate is a wholly different matter. Here is an evident advance ; not merely a reform, not merely an interference with old rights, and a disturbance of old politics, but a palpable sign of progress, a proof that the Church of England can, like that of America and of Rome, expand ; a proof that the principle of episcopacy is still recognized and approved, and an attempt to give to the entire system of the Church of England a development which its enemies have for long years struggled to withhold from her, in order that the papacy may seize on the most important positions, and plant its rival hierarchy there.

We have been for a long series of years appealing for justice in this respect. All parties in the Church of England have been united in that claim. We have sought for no mere nominal addition to our episcopate, but for a real increase proportioned to the vast increase of the country in population. We have urged that the provision for this quadrupled population is less than it was in the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, when there were not merely twenty-seven bishops, but several suffragan bishops. We have urged that the number of bishops used then to be upwards of thirty, whereas it is now only twenty-eight. We have, notwithstanding this, even been refused the paltry and merely nominal addition of four sees, promised by Lord John Russell—a promise never performed. We have urged that a large increase, much larger than Lord Blandford would give us, is *desirable*, and would be in accordance with the general practice in other countries. Still the Church would, as a whole, be satisfied with the very moderate addition to the episcopate proposed by Lord Blandford. If, however, that number should be cut down, the case would be very different. A great opportunity would have been lost for the settlement of a question deeply interesting to Churchmen, and their future attainment of any better arrangement would be apparently at an indefinite distance.

Remembering that any proposal for an increase of the episcopate is certain to meet with bitter and persevering opposition from one small section of the political world ; and remembering that Lord John Russell yielded up the interests of the Church on this point, to the obstinate perseverance of a handful of such men, amongst whom Mr. Horsman figured in company with the "Irish brigade," we certainly look with some anxiety for the ministerial measure ; and we trust that when it appears it will

not be merely a measure to gratify the reformers of the Church, but its members also.

We avail ourselves of this opportunity to offer one or two remarks, in reply to the objection which has been revived in some quarters to two classes of bishops. It is imagined that invidious contrasts might be drawn, and that it might hereafter be argued that the better endowed, or more highly privileged class ought to be placed in the position of the other class. Now surely this argues a great want of trust in the episcopate; it implies that the better endowed bishops would really be less hardworking men than the others. We feel confident that it would not be so. The very fact of the possibility of such comparison would make the better endowed class of bishops most careful that there should be no foundation for contrasts: and a generous emulation would take place, which should be most faithful, and most laborious in the work of their great Master. We have no doubt, that there would be no room for making unfavourable comparisons between the efficiency of one class and the other; and yet we feel assured, that the existence of the two classes would exercise a beneficial influence on the whole episcopal body.

We earnestly trust, however, that translation from one see to another, or at least, from poorer to richer sees, will be prohibited by law. It was strictly forbidden by the rules of the Primitive Church, and nothing can be more injurious than continual change of bishops, more especially where the apparent object of that change is the attainment of increased wealth. Such circumstances impair spiritual influence very materially.

We will sum up, in conclusion, the suggestions we have thrown out in reference to Lord Blandford's Bill.

First, we think deaneries ought to be preserved, but the emoluments of some of them may be reduced, and particular deaneries may be connected with bishoprics.

Secondly, deans and canons ought to have sufficient duties permanently annexed to their offices, such duties being either educational, diocesan, parochial, or charitable. The whole body should become, as far as possible, resident.

Thirdly, bishops ought, as a general rule, to reside in their cathedral cities, and to have fixed and smaller incomes, as recommended in the Bill, and the surplus should be applied to found seventeen new sees, which might further be endowed by the suppression of a few canonries in particular cathedrals which can spare them, and by annexing a few deaneries.

Fourthly, the episcopal and chapter property should, on these conditions, be placed under the management of the ecclesiastical

commissioners, the fee and ownership still remaining in their legal proprietors.

By this plan the whole of the chapter property would be applied to objects of a directly practical nature ; whereas, by Lord Blandford's plan, only forty-four canonries, at the outside, producing about 22,000*l.* per annum, would be so applied ; and this amount would be more than swallowed up by the endowment of new canonries and minor canonries, for the new cathedral churches, without speaking of choirs. We would omit this part of the plan ; and thus make the whole of the chapter property available for practical and spiritual purposes, in connexion with the Church.

We would also abstain from increasing the income of canons, and would in various instances diminish those of deans ; and we would provide incomes for the new sees of 3000*l.* instead of 2500*l.*, and would also find means for obtaining episcopal residences to those sees.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS, ETC.

1. Parochial Tales. 2. Tracts for Cottagers. 3. Lyra Christiana. 4. Prayers for Married Persons. 5. The Old Oak Chest. 6. Devotions for the Sick. 7. Adam Graeme of Mossgray. 8. English Songs, &c. 9. The Man of Sorrows. 10. Two Lectures on the Influence of Poetry on the Working Classes. 11. Two Lectures on the Holy Catholic Church. 12. Objections to Revival of Ecclesiastical Synods. 13. Sympathies of the Continent. 14. The Sunset Reverie. 15. The Book of Common Prayer. 16. "Excelsior." 17. Whitaker's Penny Almanack for 1852. 18. Bleak House. 19. The Happy Family. 20. Lethe, and other Poems. 21. Nuns and Nunneries. 22. The Golden Legend. 23. The First Principles of Labour, &c. 24. The Nestorians and their Rituals. 25. Life and Times of Francisco Sforza. 26. The Preaching of the Cross. 27. Thoughts on several Subjects. 28. Episcopal Authorities on the Synodal Question. 29. Allerton and Dreux. 30. Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible. 31. Confirmation Lectures. 32. The Human Hand, and other Poems. 33. Fifty-four Sermons for Families. 34. Letters from Italy and Vienna. 35. The Old Testament. 36. Michaud's History of the Crusades. 37. Palmoni. 38. Homer's Iliad. 39. Sacra Privata, &c. 40. Sequentiæ ex Missalibus Germanicis, &c. 41. Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii. 42. The Republic of Plato. 43. Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus. 44. Fiction but not Falsehood. 45. Village Sermons. 46. Congregational Psalmody. 47. Stedfast Adherence to the Church of England. 48. Spelling turned Etymology. 49. A Guide for Lent. 50. Handbook of Hebrew Antiquities. 51. Elements of Grammar taught in English. 52. Daily Family Prayer for Churchmen. 53. Life and Death. 54. Polonius. 55. The Divine Master. 56. Twice-told Tales. 57. Theophili Episcopi. 58. Homœopathy in 1851. 59. Welsh Sketches. 60. The Mother's Legacie. 61. Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles. 62. Monthly Packet of Evening Readings. 63, 64, 65. Sermons. 66. Far off. 67. Gentle Influence. 68. The Pious Churchman. 69. The Three Paths. 70. Meditations and Vows. 71. The Exiled Soul. 72. Sermons. 73. Education the Well-being of Society. 74. Lives of certain Fathers of the Church. 75. Bp. Pearson's Lectures. 76. The Song of the Bel's. 77. Babylon and Jerusalem. 78. Sermons. 79. Chaldee Reading Lessons. 80. On the State of Man. 81. Poetical Works of J. R. Lowell. 82. Catechism on the Services of the Church of England. 83. Were Heretics ever burned alive at Rome? 84. Essay on Confession, &c. 85. Zingra, the Gipsy. 86. The Nourishment of the Christian Soul. 87. Approach to the Holy Altar. 88. Political Experience of the Ancients. 89. A Gift at Confirmation. 90. England before the Norman Conquest. 91. Murray's Readings for the Rail. 92. The Messiahship of Jesus. 93. The Patriarch of the Nile. 94. The Life of Cardinal Wolsey. Miscellaneous.
-

I.—*Parochial Tales.* Oxford and London: J. H. Parker. 1852.

THIS is a well-chosen selection of simple and delightful tales from the well-known and valuable series of Parochial Tracts. The following passage is a fair sample of the style:—

"You afraid!" said Mr. Trelawny; "I thought you were a brave boy. Afraid of a laugh! of a word! Should you like to be called a coward by the boys, Edward?"

"No, sir."

"You would be afraid of that. Would you not?"

"I should not like it, sir."

"Well, then, you are ashamed of cowardice. Now tell me, which is the most important, the body or the soul?"

"The soul, sir."

"Which is best to have, the soul healthy, safe, happy and strong; or the body?"

"The soul, sir."

"Yes, Edward, every thing of the soul is better than any thing of the body. When we see a man strong, and well, and active, and handsome, and know that he is dead in sin, he seems only like a whited sepulchre to us; when we think of it we shudder. Now, Edward, there is a bravery of the soul, as well as the body; and the bravery of the body is nothing to it. If a man is a coward in soul, he is an hundredfold a coward; and he deserves all the laughter and shame that can be cast upon him.

"To be brave in body, is not to fear pain or danger to the body; to do as you did when you met the bull, not to be afraid of the body being hurt or killed. To be brave in soul, is not to fear those things which the soul feels. I do not mean, not to fear God's anger, and the sting of conscience. A man is mad, not brave, who does not fear these. To be brave in soul, is not to fear difficulty, sorrow, shame, laughter, in saving the soul. He who has not courage in saving his soul, and loses it for a laugh, is as much a coward as he who is too much afraid to pump the ship when it is filling, and so is drowned. A coward in soul, Edward, is the worst coward of any."

II.—*Tracts for Cottagers.* Oxford and London: J. H. Parker. 1852.

MORE selections from the same valuable series, containing much useful information on pig-styes, poultry, bee-hives, &c.; with suggestions regarding the village shop, the clothing club, and equally important matters; very amusing as well as practical, and thoroughly well done.

III.—*Lyra Christiana; Poems on Christianity and the Church, original and selected from the works of ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., Author of "The Christian Life," &c.* London: George Bell. 1852.

AN author's selection from his own works possesses a peculiar interest, especially when, as in the present case, that author has had and continues to have a host of admirers and a swarm of enemies. Strange is the position at present occupied by Robert Montgomery, the poetic idol of a large portion of the reading public; the scorn and derision of certain cliques and coteries which assume in the literary world a place not very unlike that of the Committee of Public Safety. There is, however, one great difference between the powers and prerogatives of the literati and the liberals in question—that whereas the decrees of the latter were submitted to with slavish obedience throughout the whole of

France, the denunciations of the former have comparatively little effect beyond the walls of the taverns sacred to their orgies, except upon the comparatively small portion of the English people which has surrendered its liberty of thought and freedom of speech into their keeping.

When we behold a noble steed whose form and bearing bespeak him calculated alike for the race-course or the battle-field, disfigured by certain unseen ulcers, upon which myriads of flies are feasting, we are rather disposed to condemn the malignity than to admire the sagacity of the busy buzzing little creatures. And a not very dissimilar emotion stirs, we believe, in the bosom of most of our countrymen when they perceive a WIT subjected to the attentions of witlings.

Such is the case with regard to Robert Montgomery, and the volume before us brings out into full view the causes which have produced these results. For, in these pages, whilst selecting many of those gems of genius which attract the admiration of the public, he has shown in other cases that strange want of taste which so often calls for the censure of the candid critic, and forms the unceasing burden of the less discerning professors of the ungente craft. In fact this little book is not so much a selection of the finest passages of our author as a miniature daguerreotype of him—form, feature, fault, failing, beauties, blemishes and all.

How magnificent, for example, is the following extract, with which the collection opens:—

“ In hush’d eternity alone,
Before all creatures were,
Jehovah held His awful throne,
Unworshipp’d by a prayer.

“ There was no space, nor scene, nor time,
Nor aught by names we call;
But center’d in Himself sublime
Was God, the All in All.

“ But through eternity there ran
A thrill of coming change,
And lustrous shapes of life began,
Around His throne to range.

“ Radiant with rapture, pure as bright,
Angelic myriads rise,
And glow and glisten in the light
Of God’s approving eyes.

“ In volumed waves of golden sound
Roll from celestial lyres
Those swelling chants, that peal around
From new-created choirs.”—p. 1.

How like the powerful pithiness of our older dramatists is the following :—

“ Partaken mercies are forgotten things ;
But expectation hath a grateful heart,
Hailing the smile of promise from afar :
Enjoyment dies into ingratitude,
Till God is buried in the boundless stores
Himself created.”—p. 7.

Again, in another strain, how exquisite are these lines :—

“ Needs no rank, nor wealth, nor learning,
When our sainted wills incline,
With a passion ever burning,
To pursue the path divine.
Humble care and cottage-scene
To the Lord's elect have been
Little Edens where they found
Angels camping all around !

“ Though thy station be but lowly,
Christ is there the soul to bless ;
Though thou seem'st forgotten wholly,
Left to toil in loneliness,
Eyes through heaven are peering down,
In thy cross to see thy crown :—
Let thy task in prayer be done,
And thy glories are begun !

“ Tell me not in gloom and anguish
Lone and needy thou art left ;
Faith can ne'er for duty languish,
Love and hope are not bereft,
If thy soul can truly say
At the close of each calm day,
' Father ! do Thy gracious will,
Let my life Thy law fulfil !'

“ Hast thou cheer'd the broken-hearted
With a look of genial love ?
As the dying breath departed,
Didst thou point to worlds above ?
Hast thou sought the peasant's door,
Soothed the sick, or cheer'd the poor,
Lighted up the widow's eye,
Or relieved an orphan's sigh ?

“ Fameless, then, though earth deny thee,
Wealth and grandeur, power and place,
More than worlds could e'er supply thee
'Tis to love the human race.

Like some instrument of sound
Changing with all airs around,
Hearts of heaven can sympathize
With whate'er a spirit tries."

What a power of pathos is there in the following simple lines,
entitled,—

" A FATHER'S GRIEF.

- " Thou art not dead, my vanish'd one !
But living in the light
Of some pure world beyond the sun,
Where death creates no night,
And sunless babes are smiling now
As bright and beautiful as thou.
- " When first I saw thy baby form
With eyes of tearful love,
I little thought a hidden storm
Was looming from above
So soon to blast my May-born flower
Beneath the blight of deathful power.
- " The Lord who gives has ta'en away,
And blest be His high name !
Oh that with calm I this could say,
And feel God's hallow'd claim :—
Cease, rebel heart ! be calm and still,
And bow beneath a Father's will.
- " Pale relic ! new enrobed for death,
Nursling of hopes and fears,
How did I watch each ebbing breath
And kiss thine infant tears,
When throbs of suffering o'er thee came
Thy wordless tongue could never name.
- " Departed babe ! how many a dream
Brighten'd thy father's heart,
When like a vision thou did'st seem
In life to take such part,
That o'er his hours there breathed a spell
More exquisite than tones can tell.
- " With thy soft features round me glowing
Amid the world I went,
And with a heart to heaven o'erflowing,
Bless'd thee, bright innocent !
And felt howe'er my path should roam,
My little starbeam reign'd at home.

“ Already Hope’s prophetic eye
Beheld some future spot,
And underneath life’s vernal sky
Pictured thy maiden lot,
Where truth and grace would be thy guide,
And all thy wants by heaven supplied.

“ I dream’d, if God thy life should spare,
How blessed it would be
To hear thy budding lips declare
Young words of Deity,
And watch thy spirit, day by day,
Rise into speech, and learn to pray.”—p. 119.

The last poem in the volume, entitled, “ GOD AND THE SOUL” is a striking exemplification of Robert Montgomery, commencing with the following extraordinary stanza :—

“ Alone we live, alone we die,
Unfathom’d by no human eye,
But search’d by Him whose wisdom can
Anatomize the inward man.”

It is almost beyond belief that the author of these strangely infelicitous lines, the first couplet of which contains a bull, and the last is actual doggerel, should conclude with these noble verses, equal in sublimity and power to any thing ever written :—

“ Let God, then, thy religion be,
And not religion God to thee :
Without Him, worlds would leave us poor,
And with Him, who can want for more ?”—p. 302.

On the other hand, again, take the following equally characteristic passage, the commencement of an extract, entitled *Reverence Due to the Sabbath* :—

“ Abhorr’d be therefore that most brutal aim,
A rank hyperbolé of godless crime,
Which massacres religion at a blow,
That ere by riot, lust, or lawless gain,
Or by some logic, false as fiends inspire,—
Our Sabbaths from their sanctity should fail
Or falter.”

What an ulcer this for the “ wee beasties ” (as they call such little creatures in Scotland) to fatten and batten upon. We will not say that Mr. Montgomery is to be “ abhorr’d ” for writing it, since we fully acquit him of any “ brutal aim ” in so doing ; though he has twined “ rank ” weeds with his poetic wreath, and run “ riot ” with his imagination, and perpetrated an awful “ massacre ” of good sense and good taste.

We have, however, said enough to indicate the character of

the volume under review ; and shall conclude by quoting a noble stanza, which has caught our eye in turning the leaves over :—

“ Around, above, beneath, 'tis all divine,
When faith the grand original can see,
And while sense worships in the outer shrine,
Know the vast world was once a thought in Thee.”

iv.—*Prayers for Married Persons ; Daily and Occasional. Selected from various sources, chiefly from the Ancient Liturgies.* Oxford and London : John Henry Parker. 1852.

A WANT which has long been felt ; and which is admirably satisfied by this excellent and unobjectionable little book.

v.—*The Old Oak Chest ; a Tale of Domestic Life.* By G. P. R. JAMES, Esq., Author of “*The Gipsy*,” &c. In 3 vols. 8vo. London : Newby.

MANY are the delightful works which have proceeded from the pen of Mr. James, though it cannot be denied that he has at times rather *over-written* himself. The present volumes are, however, amongst the most successful which he has ever produced. The plot is well imagined, the characters well sustained, the scenery exquisitely described, the interest never flags, and, withal, there is that charm of sterling Christianity which so happily distinguishes the productions of this author from those of more than one of his most celebrated contemporaries. Then, too, though our feelings are strongly excited, there is nothing harrowing or horrible in the book ; so that whilst well suited for a leisure hour of those in health, it is almost invaluable in the sick room of an invalid just recovering from dangerous illness, but still far too weak to bear any undue excitement of the nerves.

From the many passing observations with which it is enriched, we quote the following :—

“ Every action has its ghost that never dies, but wanders round us in our sojourn upon earth, influencing our fate, affecting our mind, now punishing or rewarding the deed past, now prompting to deeds to come, haunting us as the good or evil spirit, cheering us on the path of difficulty, danger, or distress, or plunging us deeper and deeper into despair and crime.”—Vol. iii. pp. 278, 279.

Again :—

“ We are accustomed to consider faith, hope, and charity merely as virtues which lead us to eternal happiness hereafter. We rarely think of the infinite blessings which each of them bestows upon us here. How faith endows us with that cheerful confidence which is the basis of all happiness ; how hope plucking fruit from every tree, gathers for

us vast treasures of enjoyment, which never can be contained in the narrow storehouse of the present; and how charity expands through infinite relations those kindly affections which are the sources of all earthly bliss."—Vol. ii. p. 58.

VI.—*Devotions for the Sick. Prayers and Thanksgivings, with Instructions for the use of Sick Persons, and their Friends, during Sickness or upon Recovery.* Oxford and London: John Henry Parker.

THIS is a very useful and excellent manual. We see, moreover, no fault in it, except, firstly, that in explaining the Creed, we find, under the head, *Born of the Virgin Mary*,—

"His mother being a holy person, not chosen to this great honour for her wealth or beauty, but by the good will of God, and because she was of rare exemplary modesty and humility."

Now that the blessed Virgin "was of rare exemplary modesty and humility," we entertain not the slightest doubt; in fact, we consider her to be the most perfect of those who have ever been naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam; to be a bright example of every virtue, and a peculiar and eminent model of womanly excellence; but we scarcely think that she was chosen to be the mother of our Lord as a reward for these merits, but rather that she was made as near perfection as possible, that she might become a less unsuitable temple for the incarnate God.

Secondly, in the directions for self-examination—we think that where the first and second commandments are expounded, it is unwise and almost unreal to omit all allusion to those idolatrous practices and principles, to the influence of which, more or less, so many, so very many, are now subjected. Romanizing is the most perilous temptation, where it is not the besetting sin of numbers of nominal Churchmen. It is scarcely right or safe, therefore, to avoid all reference to it in a work like the present.

Notwithstanding, however, these drawbacks, we heartily recommend the book both to the sick and to all those concerned with them.

VII.—*Adam Graeme of Mossgray. By the Author of "Mrs. Margaret Maitland."* 3 vols. 8vo. London: Colburn.

THIS is one of the most exquisite books of the kind with which we are acquainted, and fully keeps up the high character which the author has already acquired; there is more poetry, more rich softness both of colouring and of emotion in this than in the previous novels by the same writer, at the same time that there is the same graphic delineation of life and character, and the

same delightful playfulness ; there is also more of universal Christianity, with less of Presbyterian sectarianism than heretofore. Take it all in all, from first to last, it is a really enchanting work ; and one which ought to make those who read it better and kinder.

VIII.—*English Songs and other Small Poems.* By BARRY CORNWALL. London : Chapman and Hall. 1851.

WE are glad to see a cheap, portable, and readable edition of these justly popular poems. To most of our readers the greater number of them are probably well known. For the benefit, however, of those who may not be so well acquainted with them, we will transfer one or two of them to our pages.

How sweet and graceful is this :

“ I love him ; I dream of him ;
I sing of him by day ;
And all the night I hear him talk,
And yet—he’s far away !

“ There’s beauty in the morning ;
There’s sweetness in the May ;
There’s music in the running stream,
And yet—he’s far away !

“ I love him ; I trust in him ;
He trusteth me alway :
And so the time flies hopefully,
Although—he’s far away !”

Changing to another strain, how striking, how touching, and, alas ! how true is the following :—

“ WITHIN AND WITHOUT.

“ A LONDON LYRIC.

(WITHOUT.)

“ The winds are bitter ; the skies are wild ;
From the roof comes plunging the drowning rain :
Without,—in tatters, the world’s poor child
Sobbeth abroad her grief, her pain !
No one heareth her, no one heedeth her :
But Hunger, her friend, with his bony hand,
Grasps her throat, whispering huskily—
‘ What dost *thou* in a Christian land ?’

(WITHIN.)

“ The skies are wild, and the blast is cold ;
Yet riot and luxury brawl within :
Slaves are waiting in crimson and gold,
Waiting the nod of a child of sin !

The fire is crackling, wine is bubbling
Up in each glass to its beaded brim :
The jesters are laughing, the parasites quaffing
' Happiness,'—' honour,'—and all for *him* !

(WITHOUT.)

" She who is slain in the winter weather,
Ah ! she once had a village fame ;
Listened to love on the moonlit heather ;
Had gentleness—vanity—maiden shame :
Now, her allies are the Tempest howling ;
Prodigal's curses ; self-disdain ;
Poverty ; misery : Well,—no matter ;
There is an end unto every pain !

" The harlot's fame was her doom to-day,
Disdain,—despair ; by to-morrow's light
The ragged boards and the pauper's pall ;
And so she'll be given to dusty night !
. Without a tear or a human sigh
She's gone,—poor life and its ' fever ' o'er !
So, let her in calm oblivion lie ;
While the world runs merry as heretofore !

(WITHIN.)

" He who yon lordly feast enjoyeth,
He who doth rest on his couch of down,
He it was who threw the forsaken
Under the feet of the trampling town :
Liar—betrayed,—false as cruel,
What is the doom for his dastard sin ?—
His peers, they scorn ? high dames, they shun him ?—
Unbar yon palace, and gaze within.

" There, yet his deeds are all trumpet-sounded,
There upon silken seats recline
Maidens as fair as the summer morning,
Watching him rise from the sparkling wine.
Mothers all proffer their stainless daughters ;
Men of high honour salute him ' friend.'
Skies ! oh, where are your cleansing waters ?
World ! oh, where do thy wonders end ?"

Amongst the finest specimens in this collection of gems, we may notice the well-known " Song of the Sea," " The Rising of the North," and " The Admiral's Return," besides all those the subject of which is a personification of death, such as " The Pale Queen," " The Stranger," " The Leveller," and that very powerful and striking song entitled " King Death."

ix.—*The Man of Sorrows—The Mental Sufferings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, during His Passion—considered in Five Discourses. By the Venerable WALTER B. MANT, M.A., Archdeacon of Down, and Rector of Hillsborough.* Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1852.

THIS is just one of those sound, unpretending, and simple treatises, which it quite refreshes one to see in these days of ambitious refinement and sentimental devotion. There are some expressions here and there which should perhaps be altered in the next edition which this pamphlet will soon reach, but they in no way detract from the usefulness of these pages, *e.g.* :—

“Jesus was perfect God.”—p. 2.

Again,—

“When we reflect that the union of the Divine nature to the human in the Person of Jesus.”—p. 22.

Of course the *meaning* in both places is perfectly sound, but the language is perhaps deficient in that minute and felicitous accuracy which is desirable in such subjects.

x.—*Two Lectures on the Influence of Poetry on the Working Classes, delivered before the Members of the Mechanics' Institution, February, 1852. By the Rev. FRED. W. ROBERTSON, M.A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton.* London: Hamilton and Adams. Brighton: King. 1852.

GLITTERING, yet misty in style, and frequently fallacious in argument, with a considerable sprinkling of pernicious principle, these Lectures are one of the most perfect exemplifications that have come under our notice of milk-and-water rationalism, false liberality, and fashionable philosophy, though the intense conceit which they manifest from first to last, is perhaps their most striking characteristic.

xi.—*Two Lectures on the Holy Catholic Church.* Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1852.

WELL worth reading. Whilst enforcing the duty incumbent upon all Englishmen to communicate with the Church of England, the author asserts, amongst other things, that the French Protestants are *sound* members of the *unsound* national Church of France, which is guilty of their schismatical position.

XII.—*Some Objections to the Revival of Ecclesiastical Synods, answered by a Reference to the Circumstances under which the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem was assembled.—A Sermon preached before the University of Oxford. By the Rev. GEORGE DOMVILLE WHEELER, M.A. Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1852.*

THIS masterly discourse, published by request, and with admirable propriety dedicated to Lord Redesdale, should be in the hands of all those who are in any degree interested in the revival of convocation. The subject is treated with the most logical accuracy; and Mr. Wheeler shows that the same objections which are now urged against the synodal action of the Church might, with equal force, have been urged against the assembling of the apostolic council. He has not, indeed, given its due importance to the presence of the lay element on that celebrated occasion; but he has utterly demolished the arguments of those who would withhold from our Church this her undoubted right.

XIII.—*Sympathies of the Continent; or, Proposals for a New Reformation. By JOHN BAPTIST VON HIRSCHER, D.D., Dean of the Metropolitan Church of Freyberg, Brisgau, and Professor of Theology in the Roman Catholic University of that City.—Translated and Edited, with Notes and Introduction, by the Rev. ARTHUR CLEVELAND COXE, M.A., Rector of St. John's Church, Hartford, Connecticut, U.S. Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1852.*

THE following extract from this very important work, which has reached us too late for a longer notice, will show its nature and value:—

“A third point,” says Dr. Hirscher, “to which the Church must direct its immediate attention is the satisfaction of that general desire which is prevalent for certain reforms. This desire is of long standing, and very familiar to us. What is wanted is, for example, an improvement in the worship of the Church; a revision of its liturgical formularies; the translation of the Liturgy into the vulgar tongue; communion in both kinds; the reform of the confessional; the simplification of ceremonies, and such like changes. So, too, we need an amelioration of the ecclesiastical discipline; the abolition of the forced celibacy of the priests,” &c.—pp. 180, 181.

We shall return to this work on a future occasion.

XIV.—*The Sunset Reverie; an Allegory.* London: Masters.

THE pleasure which we have felt in reading this little Allegory induces us to recommend its perusal to our readers, and we are sure that they can only thank us for placing before them such a touching little parable on our pilgrimage towards eternity. The simple beauty with which the tale is told renders it especially suited to the young, and its poetical colouring illustrates vividly the solemn truths contained in its pages.

XV.—*The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England, adapted for general Use in other Protestant Churches.* London: Pickering. 1852.

A MORE curious or a more daring attempt we have scarcely ever discovered than that which now lies before us to Arianise the public offices of the Church of England. We fear that the suggestions of the anonymous author may be only too acceptable to many of our so-called "orthodox dissenters;" for Arianism and Sabellianism are fearfully rife among Baptists, Independents, "et hoc genus omnes." The gentleman who has supplied this curious illustration of the principles of modern nonconformists, finds the creeds so unmanageable, from his liberal point of view, that he considers it the safest course to abandon them altogether, substituting certain moral and general declarations from Holy Writ, such as, "God is a Spirit," "When ye pray, say, Our Father, which art in heaven," &c. With more than wonted dissenting self-sufficiency, he thus "improves" the Te Deum: "Thou art the King of Glory: O God. He is the only begotten Son: of the Father. When *thou* diddest determine to deliver man: thou did'st not despise his low estate." But enough of such profane *emendations*, with which we have no right to disturb the imaginations of our readers. We do not wish, however, to speak too harshly, for the intention of the editor is manifestly not profane: being an Arian, he is, of course, justified in his own eyes in promoting Arianism; yet we question his having the right to transmogrify the liturgies of the Catholic Church, and adopt them to his own special heretical purposes. Some talent is certainly exhibited in the work, and its author bears the highest testimony to the beauty of the Church's prayers. The peculiar unfairness of the preface is, that its writer, though manifestly a nonconformist, and, as we afterwards discover, an Arian, speaks therein as though he were a member of the Church; but we suppose that few, or none, will be deluded by such transparent artifice. How strange is it, that the same identical errors should be always re-appearing

throughout the course of all the ages ! Here we have ancient Arianism renewed, with all its old pretensions to orthodoxy, its fondness for liturgical forms, and its grave and serious playing at Catholicism. Of the value of the author's reasoning, we may form some notion from the following sentence taken from his preface : " There is an insuperable objection to removing the names from what are called the moveable feasts. They are, therefore, all retained except the term *Trinity*. *They* express events. But *this* term expresses nothing belonging to time. There is no day in which the living and true God began to exist or to act. The term *Trinity* is, therefore, changed into *Ministry*," &c. &c.

xvi.—"*Excelsior ;*" or, *The Realms of Poesie*. By ALASTOR.
London : Pickering. 1852.

THIS is a fanciful work, somewhat like a bright but changeful April morn, which affords much promise, however, of a summer noon-tide. Some of the opinions of the author are decidedly very immature. He will scarcely expect us to sympathize with his denunciations of " priestcraft," which are exceedingly rhapsodical, and not remarkably reasonable. Let him be assured, that that dread of being influenced by others, and more especially by the witness and authority of the Church Catholic, which appears to awaken his alarm, is one of the smallest of fears, and that there cannot be a more paltry form of disbelief than that which simply refuses to be taught ! Let him reflect, also, that many of those priests whom he reviles have quite as much genuine enthusiasm, and just as honest a purpose as his own. Setting, however, these theological lucubrations on one side, there is much of real beauty in the work before us. The imaginative criticisms on the various British poets are, for the most part, characterized by much originality and boldness of thought and expression. We cite one image from his tribute to the memory of Mrs. Hemans. " Her richly-flowing fancies," he says, " resemble a gracefully-waving cascade, steeped in moonlight ; where waters, after darting through, refreshing, and delighting lofty romantic minds, flow calmly away through the smiling valleys of more meek and humble souls, yet bestowing an equally soothing and beneficial influence on all." We are sorry not to be able to bestow more space on our tribute to the undoubted genius of " Alastor," but must conclude with this fine thought, which is as finely expressed (merely cautioning our friend against the influence of Gilfillan, and the style of Ossian) : " The thoughts of a great poet, or original thinker, like mountain torrents, sink first through the

highest talented minds, and gradually lapse there-through, till they sweep down, gathering fulness and force as they go, and pour through and fertilize the broad valleys of humanity, where their rich beneficial effects are chiefly and more extensively visible. So with the once thin streamlet of Christianity; and so with all great teachings since time began. So also with each individual mind, which is a minute representative, in its spiritual wanderings, backslidings, and aspirations, of the ages of the world."

xvii.—*Whitaker's Penny Almanack for the Year of our Lord 1852.* London: J. H. Parker, 377, Strand. 1852.

ADMIRABLY suited either for use or distribution; containing, amongst other valuable matter, a correct calendar of the lessons, &c., throughout the year, and some valuable information upon Convocation, which it is of especial moment to render universally known.

xviii.—*Bleak House.* By CHARLES DICKENS. With Illustrations, by H. K. BROWNE. No. 1.—*March.* London: Bradbury and Evans. 1852.

WE rejoice to see Charles Dickens once more in his old form, and under his old colours; we congratulate him too most heartily on a return to his old style. None of his periodical works have opened so well as this since "*Barnaby Rudge.*" We feel at once pleased and interested, and anticipate yet further pleasure, and are especially delighted to find him as simple and as racy as in the good old days of "*Pickwick,*" with none of that ultraism of sentiment and of satire which have disfigured most of his later productions. We earnestly hope to find no *Dombeyism* in the outcoming work, and that it will be equally free from monsters of the *Micawber* and *Heep* species.

xix.—*The Happy Family; or, Selfishness and Self-denial.* By the Author of "*Simple Rules,*" "*Sundays Improved,*" "*The History of a Family,*" &c. Brighton: King. London: Hamilton and Adams. 1851.

A PLEASING story pleasantly told; the printing and turning out well got up: altogether a very nice present for a young person of either sex. It is quite a relief in these days to meet with any simple-minded attempt to make either children or grown persons *Christians* instead of *controversialists*.

xx.—*Lethe, and other Poems.* By SOPHIA WOODROOFFE. Posthumously Edited by G. S. FABER, B.D., Master of Sherborne Hospital, and Prebendary of Salisbury. London: Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley.

It is seldom that the remains of the young, however highly gifted they may have been, arrest or deserve the attention of the public or the commendation of the critic, whatever amount of interest or gratification their perusal may afford to the friends and relations of the dead. The little volume before us is an exception to this rule; as we turn over page after page of these sweet and touching strains, we delight in what has been produced, whilst we regret more and more that the young authoress was removed from earth ere she had lived to accomplish all that she was clearly formed to produce.

"The following poems," says the editor, "were written from time to time, in the course of about eight years. Their author, I believe, had not the slightest idea of their publication. They were simply, during hours of leisure, the productions of a naturally elegant, and perhaps almost prematurely cultivated, mind; but still, the strongly-marked characteristic of that mind was unobtrusive modesty, courting retirement, not distinction.

"Such a person could not fail of possessing warmly-attached friends of various ages. With myself, Miss Woodrooffe was a frequent correspondent, a circumstance to me as gratifying as it may well be deemed somewhat unusual; for literary topics (and these were chiefly the drift of our letters) rarely, I believe, constitute the staple intercourse of a young grand-niece and an old grand-uncle."—p. vi.

There is something very delightful in the idea of this correspondence between a great and good man in his declining years, and a gentle girl, whose holiness, as well as her genius, rendered her his not unsuitable companion. The principal poem, *LETHE*, written at the age of nineteen, begins thus:—

"The glorious sunshine of the land of song
Beam'd o'er my early years, and made them seem
Fleetly and joyously to move along,
As flow the wavelets of a flower-lipp'd stream,
Glancing in playfulness from stone to stone,
And brightening each with lustre not its own.

"Yes, they were gay with many a rosy joy;
For many a radiant dream of hope and love,
Which sorrow might not break nor care destroy,
A circle of delight around me wove.
The silver links which bound my soul to gladness
Were long ere sever'd by the hand of sadness.

- “ My house was where the blue *Ægèan* Sea
 Murmur'd of pleasure to the sunlit shore ;
 Where, from the scented lime and myrtle-tree,
 Each breeze upon its wing sweet odours bore.
 And, underneath the sheltering plane that grew
 Beside our threshold, many a glowing hue,
- “ Of violet, purple, rosy-red, and green,
 Of glossy bay, or silvery olive, blent
 In bright confusion ; while half hid, half seen,
 The cluster'd grape and golden orange sent
 Their brilliance through the veiling leaves, and met
 The last look of the sun before he set.
- “ There, when calm Eve advanced, one lonely star
 Gleaming amid her locks ; in still delight
 Out on the quiet sea to gaze afar,
 And watch the coming of her follower, Night ;
 Greeting the moon, when other sounds were mute,
 With the soft melody of lyre or lute :
- “ And, when Hyperion through the eastern gate
 Had urged his fiery steeds, to seek the chace,
 And rouse the forest-wolf or his fierce mate,
 Or follow the fleet stag in deathly race ;
 At sultry noon beside some fount to rest,
 And idly mark some bubble on its breast :
- “ Then to return to feast, or dance, or song,
 Ever the blithest of the festive train :—
 Thus flew my hours on rainbow wings along—
 Oh, that those joyous hours could come again !
 But there were some, less joyous, far more dear,
 When they, the loving and the loved, were near.”—pp. 3—5.

These are very sweet and graceful, and so is the whole poem, mounting in several parts to far higher flights than those with which it commences.

Of the minor pieces, which have all a mournful loveliness about them, we select two.

- “ O for a home where the sunlight shines
 Through the green leaves of fruit-laden vines,
 Where dark-haired maidens all the day long
 Sing in the vineyards a low sweet song,
 And only their merry employment leave,
 To dance on the flowery turf at eve,
 With the woods above, and the cliffs below,
 And the pleasant voice of the river's flow,
 And a garden where gayest blooms are seen
 'Mid alleys of lime and poplar green,

And bowers so lonely, and dark, and deep,
 They seem made for haunted song and sleep;
 Or to lie and list to the lulling sound
 Which the falling fountains make around,
 And a little pinnace with snowy sail
 To drift down the river before the gale,
 From which to look up with half-closed eye,
 In a dreamy mood, to the sunny sky,
 And to float, float on until vesper-chime,
 And thence to the glorious midnight time,
 When closed is the lily's pearly cup,
 And the stars look down as we look up,
 Then to mingle music soft and grave,
 With the solemn sound of the moon-lit wave;—
 O who that dwelt in so fair a home,
 From its woods and waters would wish to roam?"

Pp. 65, 66.

Of far deeper meaning is the first of a series of poems, suggested by the sight of various paintings: it is headed—

THE SIBYL—DOMENICHINO.

1.

" And readest thou Fate's dark secrets: thou
 Upon whose radiant cheek and brow
 The light of youth and beauty gleams,
 From whose uplifted eye there streams
 So bright a ray, whose very hair
 Hath never known one touch of care?"

2.

" Methinks that vast and fearful gift,
 The veil of coming years to lift,
 Should bear with it a fatal power,
 To cloud thy summer's golden hour,
 To dim thine eye, to waste thy bloom,
 With grief thy spirit to consume.

3.

" A lofty solitude is thine;
 One for which many mortals pine:
 But doth not its bright loneliness
 Sadden too oft, too oft oppress?
 Is it not heavy on thy heart:
 A burden which can ne'er depart?"

4.

" Then wherefore art thou young and fair,
 With glancing cheek and gleaming hair?"

Oh ! is it not, that we may feel,
 How blithest moments may conceal,
 'Mid glowing flowers, and sunny skies,
 Life's deepest, strangest mysteries ?

5.

" Bright are the summer's joyous hours,
 With lute and song in rosy bowers.
 Who knows what each, on airy wing,
 As one by one they pass, may bring :
 What thread of anguish, love, or strife,
 Each weaves into the web of life ?

6.

" A word forgot as soon as spoken,
 Some link of kindness may have broken :
 Or may have formed some other chain,
 Firm-fixed for ever to remain :
 May, for our after-path unknown,
 A floweret or a thorn have sown.

7.

" Yes, it is well, that thou wert made
 Fair, as a being ne'er to fade ;
 'Tis well that sunny tones should bring
 Fate's darkest doom upon their wing :
 For who on earth a joy may know,
 'That is not link'd unto a woe ?"

XXI.—*Nuns and Nunneries; Sketches compiled entirely from Romish Authorities.* Seeleys : London. [12mo. pp. 342.]

It is not to be denied that there have been nunneries where a high standard of religious perfection has been aimed at, and in a certain sense realized. This, however, furnishes no reason for supporting the general system, for it is confessedly one which is not in itself essential; its advocates do not pretend that celibacy and conventual life are compulsory on any one; and since the institution, therefore, is altogether more or less voluntary, it is assuredly a most serious question whether it is allowable, when it is liable to such frightful results as those described in the volume before us, and not only liable, but actually abounding in them. To those who have high conceptions of what a nunnery is, we would only say, Look into this volume, and see what it has frequently been—see it the abode of strife, false doctrine, unhappiness, and impurity. We consider the cause of religion much indebted to the learned and able author of this volume for his labours on this deeply important subject, and we hope his work will have wide circulation.

XXII.—*The Golden Legend.* By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. London: David Bogue, Fleet-street. 1851.

It certainly does not afford us the exquisite delight, which it manifestly yields to many others, to criticise severely and unmercifully the poetical productions of our contemporaries, especially of those amongst them who are true poets in the main, such as Tennyson, Browning, Martin Farquhar Tupper, Keble, Williams, Robert Montgomery, Bandinel, or Longfellow. Nor are we wont to assume a tone of critical superiority to all authors whatsoever, condescending, at the utmost, to patronise and approve after an imperial fashion. On the contrary, we are accustomed to admire, and to admire warmly, whenever fitting opportunity is presented us; we do not wait until the public voice has established a reputation, according to the practice of both "Quarterly" and "Edinburgh," before we venture to commend strongly the productions of an author hitherto unknown to fame; we are not afraid "to commit ourselves," as men would call it, in the way of encomiastic phrases; and, on the other hand, we rarely, if ever, go out of our way for the purpose of assailing true poets for their blemishes, wilfully ignoring their merits; nor are we wont to draw forth insignificance from its native obscurity for the purpose of enjoying a cruel laugh, and demonstrating our own superiority at little cost. Such things are indeed allowable at times, but they are not usually to be commended. We might illustrate these remarks perhaps not unaptly from an article which appeared recently in a contemporary on "Modern Epics," but we forbear. We pass rather to our own unwelcome task, that of expressing the well-deserved condemnation of a certain collection of doggerel rhymes, we know not what else to call it, recently perpetrated by the American poet, Longfellow. For Longfellow is a poet, and a true and sweet one; he has a calm and quiet and sober pathos, and a mild grace, which bear affinity to the kindred properties in Tennyson's poetical stores, but yet have something distinctive and individual of their own. His "Evangeline" is sweet and holy, as many thousands of English hearts have long confessed. Many of his lyrics, such as "Footsteps of Angels," "The Old Clock on the Stairs," "The Fire of Drift-Wood," "Resignation," &c., are tenderly beautiful. There is great force and moral dignity, and calm and stately loveliness, in such poems as the "Psalm of Life," "The Light of Stars," "The Builders," &c.; and, again, there is no little poetic inspiration in the strange and fantastic "Midnight Mass for the Dying Year." "The Building of the Ship," written in emulation of "Schiller's Bell," is, on the whole, a fine poem, which grows upon the reader;

and grand are "Excelsior," "Blind Bartimæus," and "Sir Humphrey Gilbert." Powerful, also, are the poems on Slavery, especially "The Slave's Dream," and "The Quadroon Girl," the latter very painfully so; and exquisitely beautiful is "The Good Part that shall not be taken away." In fine, Mr. Longfellow is certainly a delightful poet, and, as far as we know, the only American poet worth mention. Whittier is coarse and noisy, Willis affected and artificial, Bryant tame and common-place (with few exceptions), and Mrs. Sigourney a faint echo of Mrs. Hemans. Longfellow, though usually, more or less German in form, and even in spirit, has yet a characteristic American nationality about him, and has also attained the purely beautiful. Witness those exquisite closing verses from his "Hymn to the Night," which might indeed have been composed by Goethe, and remind us much of the poetry in his "Wilhelm Meister:"—

"O holy Night! from thee I learn to bear
What man has borne before!
Thou layest thy finger on the lips of Care,
And they complain no more.

"Peace! peace! Orestes-like I breathe this prayer!
Descend with broad-winged flight,
The welcome, the thrice-prayed for, the most fair,
The best-beloved night!"

But the Teutonic tendencies of this American bard have developed themselves after the most offensive fashion in the production now before us, which was ushered into our literary world with a flourish of trumpets, and from which we at first anticipated no slight enjoyment. Our hearts misgave us, however, when, happening accidentally to see a number of the "Athenæum," we found that organ of nineteenth century conventionalism loud and emphatic in its praises. Still we hoped on against hope, until the reality of our worst fears was brought home to us by the perusal of this said "Golden Legend." A most audacious misnomer, by the by! The *Brazen* Legend it might have been far more aptly called, both from the boldness of the author in attempting to impose this "rifacimento" of German commonplaces on the English public as an original creation, and also from the general hollowness and sounding emptiness of the affair.

The subject, to begin with, is a very poor one, but the treatment is poorer still. The hero of the book, Prince Henry of Hoheneck, is afflicted with some nameless disorder,—principally, it would appear, a sombre and oppressive melancholy, like Faust of old; indeed, the whole book is a caricature of "Faust!" And a certain College of Physicians inform him that nothing can do him any good, save a young girl's voluntarily laying down her life

in his behalf. This silly conception, a distorted reminiscence, apparently, of Manfred and Astarte, is of course realized. A young lady, (a cottager's daughter, however,) is discovered, quite self-devoted enough to sacrifice herself to save the man whom she loves, even after this fantastic fashion, and by virtual suicide. In the last moment—how or wherefore nobody knows—this most absurd condition of Prince Henry's recovery is relaxed; he prevents the sacrifice, and is cured notwithstanding "for good and all," and returns from Italy with Elsie as his wife. Nothing can be sillier, we repeat, than this entire conception; more utterly meaningless, or, where there is any attempt at a meaning, more audaciously plagiarised; but bad as is the conception, the execution yet exceeds it. For the most part this mass of twaddle is written in doggerel verses, of the *hoppety-hoppety* order, with the manifest intention, on the author's part, of imitating the freer and lighter passages in the first part of "Faust." Take, for instance, as an average specimen of this nursery-rhyme school—

"My heart has become a dull lagoon,
Which a kind of leprosy drinks and drains;
I am accounted as one who is dead,
And, indeed, I think that I shall be soon."—p. 17.

A favourable specimen this, because it conveys some sort of idea! There are, however, it must be admitted, a few happier passages: for as Mr. Longfellow is a poet, he can produce nothing which shall be altogether execrable. Such is the tale of the Abbess Irningard, which contains some fine ideas, boldly expressed; and the scene of the drunken monks in the Refectory has some spirit. We especially admire the dog-Latin drinking-song, which we suspect, however, not to be Mr. Longfellow's, but simply appropriated by him, (and lawfully enough,) for his purposes:—

"O! quam placens in colore!
O! quam fragrans in odore!
O! quam sapidum in ore!
Dulce linguæ vinculum!"

And again:—

"Felix venter quem intrabis!
Felix guttur quod rigabis!
Felix os quod tu lavabis!
Et beata labia!"

Yet even this scene wants point, and has far more doggerel than wit. Here and there we come upon a single pretty thought, such as—

"Come back, ye friendships long departed,
That like o'erflowing streamlets started,
And now are dwindled, one by one,
To stony channels in the sun."—p. 12.

Or, again—

"Like violets faded were her eyes;
By this we knew that she was dead."—p. 71.

Or, perhaps—

"O noble poet! thou whose heart
Is like a nest of singing-birds
Rocked on the topmost bough of life!"—p. 111.'

Or again, *assuredly*, in a part of the book we have already praised :—

"His song was of the summer time,
The very birds sung in his rhyme;
The sunshine, the delicious air,
The fragrance of the flowers were there;
And I grew restless as a bird,
Down soft aerial currents sailing
O'er blossomed orchards, and fields in bloom,
And through the momentary gloom
Of shadows o'er the landscape trailing,
Yielding, and borne I knew not where,
But feeling resistance unavailing."—p. 211.

But then these few waifs of beauty lie scattered amid the billows of a very ocean of wish-wash, and yet pretentious mysticism. The poem opens with an absurd Introduction, meant to be singularly grand and awful and impressive, suggestive of infinite mysteries beyond, but unhappily only childish inane. Lucifer, who is depicted (though by no means intentionally) as the weakest of fiends throughout, appears, with a train of attendant sprites of darkness, battering the spire of Strasburg Cathedral, while a tempest is at its height. The intention to take a lofty flight is manifest from the aerial attitude of this commencement, but unhappily the "poetry"—if we dare so misuse that oft-degraded word—falls at once plump to the earth, and grovels in the dust. Conceive any thing, if you can, O reader, more silly than this!

"LUCIFER.

"Hasten! hasten!
O ye spirits!
From its station drag the ponderous
Cross of iron, that to mock us
Is uplifted high in air!

" VOICES.

" O we cannot !
For around it
All the saints and guardian angels
Throng in legions to protect it :
They defeat us every where !"

And so they proceed ; the bells ringing out between, the old well-known "*Laudo Deum verum, Plebem voco,*" &c., Lucifer suggesting in turn, and each time receiving a reply asserting the impossibility of the task, now that the bells should be shattered, now that the windows should be broken, now that the doors should be smashed,—until at last he concludes, as he might have begun,—

" Baffled ! baffled !
Inefficient
Craven spirits ! leave this labour
Unto Time, the great destroyer !
Come away, ere night is gone !"

On which one is only inclined to make some such comment as—

Doggerel ! doggerel !
Inefficient
Humdrum droner ! leave this labour
To burlesque old German stories !
Wilt thou rhyme for ever on ?

Never was there a more melancholy specimen of the would-be sublime and mysterious issuing in the anile and contemptible. Every where, as Mr. Longfellow unintentionally parodies his German models, we are reminded of the hand of the coarse peasant, or clumsy child, striking chords at random on the minstrel's lyre. In the first scene of this "dramatic mystery" (save the mark !) we have a wretched rifacimento, as of course, of the first scene of "*Faust* ;" the same complaints on the part of the hero, couched in much the same doggerel form, only that Goethe's poem, despite its quaintness and oddity, is every where redolent of inspiration, and this is a paltry copy, which betrays the influence of the most glaring plagiarism, at every second line. As Mephistopheles came to Faust, so of course Lucifer to Prince Henry, and that for no other purpose than to bring him a certain glass of cordial, about which an immense stir is made, and which turns out to have no effect whatever, as far as we can discover, on the progress of the piece. The long and short of the matter is, to speak "*sans cérémonie,*" that Prince Henry gets drunk, and talks a good deal of nonsense under the vinous influence, remarking—

"Beneath me I can feel
The great earth stagger and reel."—p. 27.

No very strange experience, we believe, in the case of persons in this condition ; upon which some invisible angel suggests, sensibly enough, in our opinion, with reference to the probable sensations of the morning after the feast,—

"Touch the goblet no more !
It will make thy heart sore
To its very core !"—p. 27.

Upon which the Prince, after a little more injudicious indulgence, grows sentimental ; and finally dozes off, upon the whole pleasantly, murmuring,—

"Rare physician ! rare physician !
Well hast thou fulfilled thy mission !"

And the angel ("*receding*") gives voice to the prophetic moral :—

"Alas ! alas !
Like a vapour the golden vision
Shall fade and pass,
And thou wilt find in thy heart again
Only the blight of pain,
And bitter, bitter, bitter contrition !"

Assuredly it needed no ghost from the grave, or no angel either, to tell the wine-bibber so much. But is not this melancholy trash ? Is it not sad that a man of real talent should make an exhibition of this order ? We cannot follow the "Legend" through all its fruitless turnings and twinings ; but we must enter our protest against Mr. Longfellow's abuse of such a really beautiful story as that of the Monk Felix in his most miserable doggerel (pp. 43 to 50). This is desecration indeed ; and then, in one breath, as it were, follows the offensive fiction of "the Sultan's Daughter ;" worse than offensive, nothing less than blasphemous. All the peasant-scenes, meant to be so very innocent, are, for the more part, only silly ; and the character and language of Elsie constitute her the most palpable caricature of Margaret in "Faust." Because Goethe had written a beautiful little rhymed prayer for Margaret, Longfellow must write a very detestable one for Elsie. Take a specimen :—

"If my feeble prayer can reach thee,
O my Saviour, I beseech thee,
Even as thou hast died for me,
More sincerely
Let me follow where thou ledest,
Let me, bleeding as thou bleedest—"

But it seems irreligious even to cite such unreal devotional utterances; to associate such a theme with such doggerel! Here and there, as we have said, Mr. Longfellow has a redeeming moment. Elsie's account of death is natural enough, and rather pretty, though her reasoning with her parents, to justify her voluntary suicide, is most unreasonable, and indeed most irreligious. Then comes a scene in a village-church, a priest at the confessional about to receive the confession of Prince Henry, who departs, finding the Prince does not keep his appointment, and whose place is then occupied by Lucifer; but little is made of all this, though something might have been; and indeed the whole scene conveys no other impression than that of a tedious plagiarism. Then follow two or three particularly tiresome scenes in Strasburg, where we have a direct imitation of what is itself an imitation,—Bailey's "Festus,"—Mr. Longfellow wishing, we suppose, to be impartial in his favours. Then follows a Miracle-Play, which is offensive and poverty-stricken, void of all point, and utterly devoid of beauty. The ideas are taken, for the more part, from the early apocryphal Gospels; for, at all events, Mr. Longfellow cannot be twitted with having *invented* any thing here or elsewhere in this whole mass of rubbish: but the Miracle-Play is needlessly and impertinently offensive, and slanderously blasphemous. And it is no answer to say, that the real Miracle-Plays contain things which are quite as bad, or worse. Mr. Longfellow's audience is not that of the Middle Ages; neither their good nor their evil properties belong to these times; and such blasphemous familiarity on such sacred subjects can now only prove a stumbling-block to simple faith, and familiarize the mind with the most irreverent habits of thought. We do not attach the importance we otherwise should do to this affair, because the whole work is such an utter failure, so exceedingly *flat* and *dull*. Were it otherwise, this Miracle-Play might effect no little mischief.

But we must draw these comments to a close, which have already extended beyond the space we had intended to devote to them. One of the most absurd portions of the poem is Section VI., intended to be the climax, where Prince Henry, after travelling the whole way from Germany with this poor girl, who means to die for him, makes a miserable sham-fight against her self-destruction at the last, and in which Lucifer continues to give vent to the usual amount of wordy twaddle. In his would-be humoristic utterances, by the by, we recognize ever and anon the manifest influence on the mover of these puppets of Mr. Browning's quaint metrical contortions in his "Christmas Eve and Easter Day." The conclusion is characteristic: two record-

ing angels mounting up to heaven, and talking as they go, very mistily, though not mystically, as Mr. Longfellow imagines. The bad angel bears a book containing the record of human vice and folly, more especially the hero's: as he mounts the words fade,—

“ And in their place
Runs a white space !”—p. 299.

Ah, that it could be so with Mr. Longfellow's own record! but we are afraid the black and white will stand against *him*, at all events for a generation or two; since those who have his poems will be likely also to purchase his parody. The angel proceeds:—

“ Down goes the sun!
But the soul of one,
Who by repentance
Has escaped the dreadful sentence,
Shines bright below me as I look.
It is the end !”

But this is not the end: there is more yet respecting “a blackness inwardly brightening,” which proves to be the baffled Lucifer, respecting whom it is profoundly, and, as Mr. Longfellow doubtless considers, most originally remarked, that as God suffers him to be, he, with or against his will,—

“ Labours for some good
By us not understood.”

But Mr. Longfellow has disappointed us indeed. He should do something better than reproduce these now deplorably commonplace “utterances of the German mind;” these stalest of the stale “revelations of the infinite;” these old clothes, worn threadbare and cast off by their original makers and wearers. When we meet his Muse next in the literary world, we trust that she will have excogitated something more tangible than this quasi-Teutonic “Much Ado about Nothing!”

XXIII.—*The First Principles of Labour, Property, and Money, demand primary Consideration for Home Agriculture.* By R. GALE. London: Ollivier, 59, Pall Mall. 1852.

THE author's object would seem to be to show, that our manufacturing and commercial systems are unsound; and that the facilities which “commercial bills of exchange” afford unprincipled speculators, produce the most mischievous effects. He is dissatisfied with our present monetary system, and appears to be

favourable to a national symbolical currency, and holds that the landed or agricultural interest has been sacrificed to the moneyed interest; surely not altogether without reason. Most of our readers may be inclined to say that the fact needed no demonstration.

xxiv.—*The Nestorians and their Rituals: with the Narrative of a Mission to Mesopotamia and Coordistan, in 1842—1844, and of a late Visit to these Countries in 1850; also Researches into the present Condition of the Syrian Jacobites, Papal Syrians, and Chaldeans; and an Inquiry into the Religious Tenets of the Yegedees. By the Rev. GEORGE P. BADGER, one of the Hon. East India Company's Chaplains in the Diocese of Bombay. In 2 vols. 8vo. London: Masters.*

THE appearance of this work will be regarded with interest by them who are old enough to remember the circumstances connected with the Mission undertaken to Mesopotamia, with a view to the benefit of the Nestorian Christians of Coordistan; and the lamentable persecution of that unhappy race, which ensued shortly after. Mr. Badger had the amplest opportunity for becoming acquainted with all the circumstances of the Nestorians, and his volumes contain, accordingly, a great mass of the most valuable information, including translations from all their ritual books. It is adorned with a great number of illustrations, representing interesting scenery, churches, portraits, inscriptions, &c. The work is edited by the Rev. J. M. Neale, whose criticisms, as editor, are occasionally rather stringent.

One circumstance strikes the reader at the commencement of the work—the great influence exercised over the fortunes of Eastern Christianity by Russia and France. Romanism is protected and supported throughout the East by French influence: it is a great branch of French policy, by means of which it maintains a French party throughout the Turkish dominions. Russia patronises the Greek and the Armenian faith, and is opposed to Papal proselytism. But the restless activity of Popery, and its arts and contrivances, enable it to make continual inroads on other communions.

There is, however, another agency at work, which appears to be making some progress—that of Dissenting Societies. Mr. Badger found that there was much jealousy in this quarter at the proposed Mission. He also learned that they were acting in a sectarian spirit, and he resolved to hold no intercourse with them. He remarks that he met some of their disciples, who

looked with contempt on outward forms and rites, and attached the most extreme importance to Protestantism. It is evident that Mr. Badger held High Church views of such a complexion as did not imply any sympathy with mere Protestantism; yet it would seem that these people might be viewed with somewhat more indulgence than Mr. Badger seems to have extended towards them.

The account of Mr. Badger's journey is very interesting, and the details he presents of the rites, customs, and tenets of all the Oriental sects, is of great value and importance. His constant theme of lamentation is, that there are no missions of the English Church in those countries.

xxv.—*Life and Times of Francisco Sforza, Duke of Milan; with a Preliminary Sketch of the History of Italy.* By W. POLLARD URQUHART, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. Blackwoods: Edinburgh.

THE life of a man who rose from a comparatively low origin to be the sovereign prince of a very considerable State, is an interesting study in itself; but, in the present instance, the life of this successful prince is also that of a great general and skilful politician, who wins his way amidst difficulties of all kinds by the force of his own intellect, and the address which he manifests on all occasions. Mr. Urquhart is evidently extremely conversant with all the details of Italian history, and he has produced in the *Life of Sforza*, a work which has high claims on attention, as a clear and masterly exposition of the history of Italy in the fifteenth century. It tends to illustrate the state of morals in that country previously to the Reformation.

xxvi.—*The Preaching of the Cross, and the Visible Church. A Sermon preached November 28, 1851, in Norwich Cathedral, at the Ordination of the Lord Bishop of Norwich.* By the Rev. THEYRE T. SMITH, M.A., Vicar of Wymondham, and Honorary Canon of Norwich. London: Fellowes.

WE had lately occasion to notice a pamphlet, by the author of this Sermon, in which he pointed out the errors that are prevalent in reference to the Church. The discourse before us is written in the most comprehensive spirit of liberality, and inculcates the opinion that all the dissenting communities are essentially one with us, and are equally a portion of Christ's Church. Of course, the author regards ordination as a non-essential.

Though we are unable to concur with the lamented author in some of his views, we yet avail ourselves of the opportunity to express our respect for his memory, and we regret that so able and pious a man has been removed from amongst us.

The Rev. Theyre T. Smith was a profound thinker, an humble, amiable, and single-minded man, and particularly well versed, as his University Sermons show, in the Unitarian controversy. Originally a Dissenter, he was sent to Glasgow; but, reading Hooker, he became satisfied that Episcopacy was the more scriptural form of Church government, and left Glasgow for the University of Cambridge. He regretted that he had not gone to Oxford, being an extremely good logician, but having no taste for mathematics. He was ordained by the Bishop of Lincoln, and, after serving a curacy in Huntingdonshire, and another in Essex, he was appointed, by Mr. Benson, assistant preacher at the Temple. There he remained till Mr. Benson resigned the Mastership in 1845, when Lord Lyndhurst appointed him to a small living, Newhaven, from which the present Bishop of Ely removed him to Wymondham, in Norfolk. He filled the office of Hulsean Lecturer, in 1839 and 1840, and was frequently appointed one of the select preachers at Cambridge. His works have had a very limited sale; for his style and manner of thinking were far from popular. He wanted the power of familiarly illustrating a subject with the pen. He could speak extempore with a force and facility to which few men could attain. At Newhaven he sometimes preached without a manuscript, with pathos so irresistible, that the congregation (far from a refined one) were dissolved in tears. No one ever lived who was more beloved by his friends; and he is universally and deeply lamented by his parishioners at Wymondham. He is still had in grateful remembrance by many of the Templars, to some of whom—especially the sceptical—he was most useful. In one thing he followed the steps of his Master, and, while showing no quarter to error, he was most tenderly considerate towards the erring. Mr. Smith was strongly opposed to the peculiar views of Calvin. He was a great metaphysician, and used to think out all his subjects. The following passage is from a sermon in his volume of discourses before the University and Temple. It is one “On the Design of our Saviour in the Use of Parables.”

“The *sense* of the Scriptures is our main and only concern. The cavils at the diction in which that sense is conveyed, and no less the ardent and lavish praise which is sometimes brought to it—as though it were essential to our belief of the Bible to rank it with the sublimest models of eloquence, and even to exalt it above them—we hold to be of the lowest insignificance. What reasonable man can attach import-

ance.to the mere wording of a communication from God, describing the path of His wondrous dispensations, and illustrating the darkness of futurity? Or what matters the shape of 'the cup of salvation,'—its appearances to the eye, the devices, albeit they are noble, that are figured on its surface? Can we heed such things, when we are taking to our lips the element of life, and allaying the deep thirst for immortality?"

XXVII.—*Thoughts on several Subjects. By the Author of "Memoirs of a Working Man," &c. &c.* C. Cox, King William-street, Strand.

WE do not usually, in our critical notices, desire to arrest the sympathy as well as the admiration or curiosity of our readers. We *are* desirous of doing so in the present instance. The writer of the above little work is a tailor, already favourably known to the public as the author of "Memoirs of a Working Man." We gather that at the close of his sixtieth year, and "suffering severely from spasmodic asthma," he is seeking to eke out a scanty subsistence by the publication of this little volume, which is really in its way, a remarkable little book. We have been particularly struck with the earnest practical piety which pervades it, and with the writer's intimate knowledge of, and deep reverence for, holy Scripture. We very heartily wish him the success he deserves.

XXVIII.—*A Catena of Episcopal Authorities on the Synodal Question; or its Progress demonstrated by Extracts from Charges recently delivered by Dignitaries of the Church of England: with Notes and Observations.* London: Rivingtons. [Sm. 8vo. pp. 38.]

A VALUABLE and useful collection of authorities in favour of the revival of a convocation or synod, including the opinions of men of various schools. This tract, which is published by the Society for the Revival of Convocation, is adapted for circulation amongst the intelligent classes of Churchmen. The prelates whose writings and speeches are here cited on different sides of the question are the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Gloucester, Manchester, Oxford, Salisbury, and St. David's. Some extracts also are made from a charge by Archdeacon Churton. The following remarks by the Archbishop of Dublin, in reply to one of the chief objections to the assembling of a synod, are well worthy of attention.

"As for the objection which was urged, that differences of opinion and contests, and perhaps stormy debates, would be likely to arise, in

any assembly of men—whether called councillors, commissioners, delegates, or by whatever other name—met to inquire into, and to decide on, important and interesting matters, and that this might be expected equally, whether they sat as a permanent governing body, or as a temporary commission, to be finally dissolved when it shall have gone through a certain definite task, all this was fully admitted. But it was remarked, in reply, that still greater, and more widely spread, and far more unsatisfactory contests, and more incurable discontents take place, and are sure to take place, in the *absence* of a government; when there is no recognized and legitimate channel open for suggestions, for complaints, for arguments, and statements, and proposals.

“It might, indeed, have perhaps seemed antecedently probable that peace and satisfaction, at least *within* the Church, might have been secured, though at a great sacrifice, by the withdrawal from its communion, from time to time, not only of those radically opposed to its doctrine and worship, but of many others also, who might have been retained in it without any compromise of principle. Experience, however, shows that even at this cost, internal peace and satisfaction are not to be purchased; that the health and ease of the remaining portion of the body cannot be obtained, even by the successive amputation of limbs.

“In the Houses of Parliament, (it was urged,) violent and sometimes factious contests undoubtedly occur, and instances of unwise legislation may be found. But would any one venture, on these grounds, to propose the discontinuance of Parliaments? Would any one say, ‘We are satisfied with the existing laws, and want no changes; *nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*; we would fain avoid all the wanton legislation, and all the strife of words and party spirit, which a Parliament never fails to call forth; let us dispense with it altogether!’

“This experiment, we know, was actually tried, on grounds which doubtless appeared plausible at the time, by the unhappy Charles the First, and we all know the result.

“Then, as for the apprehended predominance, in any regularly constituted assembly, of the misjudging, and violent, and factious, it was maintained in reply, that such men are incomparably more influential, and their numbers and power more apt to be over-rated, in the absence of any regular government. And an instance was adduced, which I believe might serve as a specimen of thousands of others, in which a factious clamour was raised in a certain parish against some proposed measure; such that even several of those favourably disposed to the measure were almost over-awed by what they had been led to believe was the voice of the parishioners; but when the expedient was resorted to of *collecting the votes*, it was found that those who had been representing themselves as ‘The Parish,’ were, to those opposed to them, less than one to ten! It was urged, again, that very recently, some Australian bishops had held a kind of conference or synod, at which certain resolutions on several points had been passed, and which had called forth loud complaints from many lay-members of our Church in

those parts; and this was considered as indicating that any kind of assembly convened by competent authority to deliberate on any ecclesiastical matters would be most distasteful to the lay-members of our Church, and would be productive of dissension. But it seems most probable that that meeting had been suspected—not unnaturally—of a design (which, however, I am far from myself attributing to those bishops) to claim for those resolutions—what they certainly had no right to claim—some *binding* authority, as emanating from a *body*, beyond what each bishop already possessed in his own diocese; and that such a (supposed) assumption of power was the chief thing that called forth expressions of indignation, and of alarm.

“If, as was observed in the debate, some ten or twenty members of either House of Parliament should think proper to meet in an assembly constituted by their own authority, and to lead or leave men to believe that they regarded themselves as a legislative body, whose decisions were to be binding on all, then, however wise in themselves these decisions might be, no one can doubt that such a usurpation would excite resentment and opposition.

“But if any one should infer from that resentment that the meeting of a Parliament *regularly summoned by the Sovereign* must be productive of dissension, and that the whole institution of Parliaments had better be abolished, most men would perceive that the very opposite conclusion would be the more reasonable.”

It is true, indeed, that the dissensions in the Church of England at present are very great; but is it not possible that their existence arises partly from the suspension of synods? We are far from desirous of seeing convocations enter on doctrinal discussions; we should have no objection to see their functions limited as far as might be deemed prudent; we should be glad to see every precaution used to ensure gravity, deliberation, full investigation, and temperate and Christian discussion. We shall be willing to see convocation remodelled in order to meet these conditions. But assuming, as a matter of course, that the Upper House retains its power of veto, and the Crown also, and that no measure would be binding on the laity without their own consent in convocation, or would affect legal rights without the sanction of Parliament, it does seem to us that there would be no real danger in the experiment, and if it were found to lead to bad results, it could cease. The present state of things is not so satisfactory as that men may sit down quietly, and not seek for reform and improvement.

xxix.—*Allerton and Dreux; or the War of Opinion. By the Author of a "Rhyming Chronicle."* In 2 vols. London: Wertheim and Mackintosh. [Sm. 8vo. pp. 449, 424.]

THIS work narrates the history of two clergymen, one of the High Church, and the other of the Evangelical school, and the process by which the former is led to adopt the views of the latter. The High Churchman is represented as a well-disposed but very unsubdued person, but his uncharitable and carnal feelings are removed by the pressure of affliction. The author takes rather a narrow view of High Churchmen, for we trust that such feelings as he ascribes to them are not necessarily or generally connected with those views; but certainly it is very possible to find instances such as he describes. Evangelical clergy also may be found, whose spirit is by no means so Christian as that of Dreux. The story, however, is delightfully told; and, as a religious tale, we have seldom met one which is throughout more ably written and well sustained. The dialogue is pointed and lively, and the descriptive parts are extremely good. We anticipate an extensive sale for these volumes.

xxx.—*Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible. Abridged, modernized, &c. by THEODORE ALOIS BUCKLEY, B.A., &c.* London: Routledge. [12mo. pp. 711.]

THIS extremely cheap and well-executed volume will be an acceptable gift to students of the Scripture; it is founded on Calmet's Dictionary; but is so much abridged, condensed, and revised, as to be in fact almost a new work. From all that we have seen of it, we think it is very carefully and well executed.

xxxi.—*Confirmation Lectures delivered to a Village Congregation in the Diocese of Oxford. By ALFRED POTT, M.A., &c.* London: Masters.

THESE Lectures on Confirmation "were preached to a very simple and mostly uneducated congregation in a small country village." The author may depend upon it that he has done a good work in publishing these lectures. They are admirably adapted for their purpose; just the sort of thing that the poorer classes would understand and be influenced by. We very seldom see books of this kind; and we recommend it to the country clergy who have to minister to simple and uneducated congregations.

xxxii.—*The Human Hand, and other Poems.* By the Rev. C. F. WATKINS, Vicar of Brizworth. Second Edition. London: Pickering.

THIS is a new edition of poems published many years since, and which have not received the attention and notice their merit fully entitle them to. The longest poem—that on the “Human Hand,” or “Wonder of Art,” is moral and reflective in its character rather than scientific. It takes us to the works which the hand of man has accomplished. The writer’s views on religion and politics may be described as “orthodox.” We extract a few lines from his Elegy on Lord George Bentinck;—

“Alas! too little, and too lately known,
Whom we began to think and call our own.
Alas! that suddenly that heart of thine
Should cease to vibrate, and its heat resign;
So great, so noble, and so vigorous found—
Large was its frame, and strong with muscles bound,
To no one party is thy loss confined;
No faction claimed thee as a leader blind—
An empire mourns thee in her utmost bound,
Whose every right in thee a champion found.”—p. 103.

xxxiii.—*Fifty-four Sermons written for Sunday Reading in Families.* By JOHN PENROSE, M.A., Vicar of Langton-by-Wragby, &c. London: Murray. [8vo. pp. 482.]

THESE Sermons, being intended for family reading, are almost exclusively practical, and do not enter on any discussion of evidences or other controversy. They seem to be very well adapted for their purpose, being calm in their tone, instructive, dwelling much on the great essentials of religion, so as to promote a firm and lively faith, and abstaining from all questions likely merely to engage the intellect. We have no doubt they will be very acceptable to a large class of readers.

xxxiv.—*Letters from Italy and Vienna.* Cambridge: MacMillan.

THESE Letters present a series of clever sketches of the state of religion and manners in Germany and Italy. The descriptions of the Roman Catholic worship are very vivid. The author is evidently one who views the matter without any very fixed principles, and who is always ready to look upon ceremonies in an absurd point of view, or to admire them on æsthetic grounds, without much regard to their accordance with the Word of God. The work is that of an intelligent man of the world, rather than of a Christian.

xxxv.—*The Old Testament; Nineteen Sermons on the First Lessons for the Sundays from Septuagesima to the Third Sunday after Trinity.* By F. D. MAURICE, M.A., &c. London: J. W. Parker.

THE practice of explaining the lessons of the Old Testament as they are read in the course of Divine Service, appears to be a very useful and desirable one. Mr. Maurice has adapted his Expositions to the intellect and circumstances of the highly-educated congregation to whom they are addressed. They are full of ability and ingenuity, and, on the whole, appear to be well calculated to meet objections which may be raised by infidels, and to promote reverence for the Word of God. The union of Church and State is referred to in more than one place, and subjected to some discussion, in a good spirit.

xxxvi.—*Michaud's History of the Crusades. Translated from the French by W. ROBSON.* In 3 vols. London: Routledge.

THE volumes before us are amongst that very cheap series which the enterprising publisher is engaged in supplying to English readers. Michaud's great work, the "History of the Crusades," is now before the public in an English dress; and illustrative, as it is, of one of the most remarkable periods of mediæval history, deeply connected with the rise of civilization and the development of the papal supremacy, we have no doubt it will be perused with the attention and interest which it so amply deserves.

xxxvii.—*Palmoni: an Essay on the Chronological and Numerical Systems in Use among the Ancient Jews, &c.* London: Longmans. [8vo. pp. 681.]

THE work before us is one of immense labour and research, and is of such a character altogether, that, in our day, it has little chance of obtaining the attention which is on many accounts due to it. The author was led, he informs us, by the extensive chronological discrepancies in the writings of Josephus, which appeared totally inexplicable as the results of mere accident, to suspect that all these various numbers had reference to some mystical system of chronology, and were introduced "rather with a view to the production of predetermined results, than to the exhibition of the actual duration of time." The large volume before us carries out this idea in all its details, and with great learning and ingenuity.

XXXVIII.—*Homer's Iliad. With English Notes, and Grammatical References. Edited by the Rev. THOMAS KERCHEVER ARNOLD, M.A., &c. London: Rivingtons.*

A VERY portable and convenient edition of the "Iliad" for school use. The English notes, and appendices on the Homeric words, are excellent, and will be found of essential service in the perusal of the text.

XXXIX.—*Sacra Privata, &c. By the Right Rev. THOMAS WILSON, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. With Notes and an Appendix by a PRIEST OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. London: Cleaver.*

THIS edition of the "Sacra Privata" contains an elaborate Appendix asserting the sacrificial view of the Eucharist. We observe that the writer does not refer to Scripture in proof of this view.

XL.—*Sequentiæ ex Missalibus Germanicis, Anglicis, Gallicis, &c. Recensuit, notulisque instruxit JOANNES M. NEALE, A.M. London: J. W. Parker.*

THE reviving taste for mediæval hymns, which the author alleges in his Latin Preface as the reason for publishing the Sequences, is, in our own opinion, exactly the cause which should have prevented him from publishing this work. Is it desirable to promote a taste for such Sequences as the following?—

"Ave, Caro Christi Regis veneranda,
Esca gregis novæ legis admiranda,
Tu fidelibus, horis omnibus, es adoranda:
Casto corde, sine sorde, digne manducanda."—p. 25.

XLI.—*Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii auctore Joanne Pearson Episcopo Cestrensi. Editio nova Annotationibus et Præfatione ad hodiernum controversiæ statum accommodata. 2 vol. Oxonii: J. W. Parker. [8vo. pp. 662.]*

THIS new edition of Bishop Pearson's *Vindiciæ* is published under the editorial care of Archdeacon Churton, whose Annotations add to the value of the work, and whose Preface very ably and satisfactorily disposes of the objections against the genuineness of the Greek Epistles of Ignatius, founded on the recent discovery of certain Syriac abridgments of them by Mr. Cureton. We trust that this Preface will be considered conclusive of the question by all fair-minded persons.

XLII.—*The Republic of Plato. Translated into English, with an Introduction, Analysis, and Notes. By J. L. DAVIES, M.A., and D. J. VAUGHAN, M.A., Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: MacMillan.*

THIS translation of the most interesting of Plato's works, conducted with all the advantages of improved criticism, and a refined scholarship, will be of great value, not merely to those who are enabled to study the original, but to all who are desirous of attaining a knowledge of the principles of the Platonic philosophy, or of reviving their acquaintance with it. It is preceded by a very able critical Introduction, and by a careful Analysis of the work for the use of students.

XLIII.—*Mount Athos, Thessaly, and Epirus: being a Diary of a Journey from Constantinople to Corfu. By GEORGE F. BOWEN, Esq., M.A., Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons.*

THIS journal appeared at intervals in the "Colonial Church Chronicle," and it is now republished in aid of the fund for Colonial Bishoprics. The writer is a scholar and a gentleman; and though his tour takes him over ground already pretty well known to the English reader, he writes with so much spirit and liveliness, that his work will, we doubt not, be perused with general interest. It places the inhabitants of those countries before us in a very graphic way: we talk with Pashas and Turks just as if they were rational and inquiring men, instead of mere turbaned, and scimitared smokers, lounging all the day on their divans. And we find that in those lands as well as our own there are sharp fellows who want looking after, and men who enjoy a dry joke, and plenty of other things that put us in mind of men elsewhere. It is an impressive fact, as stated by Mr. Bowen, that from *two-thirds* to *three-fourths* of the population of European Turkey are Christians, of the Greek Church.

XLIV.—*Fiction but not Falsehood: a Tale of the Times. London: Whittaker and Co.*

THIS tale is chiefly intended as an antidote to Romanism and Infidelity. It relates the perversion of a young man of unsettled mind to Romanism, and his subsequent return to the truth. It is not characterized by any remarkable power, but still it is instructive and interesting.

XLV.—*Village Sermons. A Second Volume. By the Rev. ARTHUR G. BAXTER, M.A., Rector of Hampreston, Dorset.* London: J. W. Parker.

WE are happy to renew our acquaintanceship with Mr. Baxter's Sermons, of which the second volume is now before us. In our opinion this volume is superior to that which preceded it. The style is not only accurate and refined, but is animated and impressive; while the practical and devotional character of the series renders it a very valuable contribution to the religious literature of the day.

XLVI.—*Congregational Psalmody for the Services of the Church of England. Arranged for every Sunday and Holiday in the Year, for each Service, and for each Part of each Service. By HENRY HUGHES, M.A., Perpetual Curate of All Saints, Gordon-square.* Third Thousand. London: Shaw.

WHY is not a collection of hymns and psalms like this adapted by the Christian Knowledge Society, and printed at a cheap rate, so as to be available for all congregations throughout England? We have never seen a better selection than the "Congregational Psalmody" of Mr. Hughes: it appears to us to be admirably adapted for our congregations generally. We are not aware of the price of this little manual, which contains 386 hymns; but we should say it would be cheap at a shilling. The Christian Knowledge Society ought to give us a hymn book for 6d. or 4d.; and would they do so, they would have a prodigious sale for the publication.

XLVII.—*Stedfast Adherence to the Church of England, recommended and enforced in Three Village Sermons and a Village Story. By the Rev. EDWARD BERENS, Vicar of Shrivenham.* London: Rivingtons.

IT appears that this little work has been rendered necessary by the attempts of Dissenters to establish their worship in the respected author's parish. It consists of a plain and affectionate vindication of the Church of England, and its ministry; and a dissuasive from schism. We have no doubt that a work like this will be found very useful: but the great antidote to dissent after all, is pastoral blamelessness, and pastoral activity: this will generally tell in the long run. The people must see that their clergy are more devoted, more fervent in prayer, in preaching, and in all good works, than their rivals.

XLVIII.—*Spelling turned Etymology. Part I. By the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD. Rivingtons. Latin vid English, being the Second Part of Spelling turned Etymology.*

THE object of the first part of this publication is to enable teachers to explain the meaning of words while teaching spelling. This is a most desirable object. The second part applies spelling to teach Latin. The whole vocabulary of the Latin existing in the English language, the Latin roots are given, and thus Latin and English are learnt at the same time. This is an ingenious notion; and it appears excellently carried out.

XLIX.—*A Guide for Lent; with Devotions and Scripture Lectures for each Day. By the Rev. J. SKINNER, M.A., Senior Curate of St. Barnabas, Pimlico. London: Hayes.*

THE author refers in his dedication to the "heavy sorrow" of the congregation in the loss of their late pastor. Being unable to complete his plan, he recommends those "who have been accustomed to study the deep things contained in Dr. Pusey's translations of Avrillon, Surin, and Scupoli," to add daily readings from Andrews, Taylor, Horneck, and Lucas. The Devotions are chiefly taken from the writings of eminent English divines, "some from ancient sources, or from the *Paradise of the Christian Soul*,"—a Roman Catholic work. "The Scripture Lectures, mostly taken from the *Breviary*, will perhaps supply a need which our own Church, for some reason unknown—if not from oversight—has left unprovided." We have perhaps sufficiently indicated the character of this publication.

L.—*A Handbook of Hebrew Antiquities; for the Use of Schools and Students. By the Rev. HENRY BROWNE, M.A., Prebendary of Chichester, &c. London: Rivingtons.*

THIS is one of Mr. Arnold's series of Handbooks. It comprises a great mass of information on all subjects connected with the laws and customs of the Jewish people from the earliest period, condensed into a very small compass, and followed by questions. It is chiefly derived from German works of a similar description, and appears to be very satisfactorily executed.

LI.—*The Elements of Grammar taught in English; with Questions. By the Rev. EDWARD THRING, M.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: MacMillan.*

THE difficulty of teaching grammar to children is well known.

This little book is an attempt to facilitate the process; it is "strictly intended for teachers and learners." To give some notion of the course pursued, we will quote the commencement:—

"THE SENTENCE.

"No sentence can be without a subject, and a predicate or speech-clause concerning the subject."

After this follow some remarks explaining the rule, and questions on them.

The next rule is on the noun and verb.

It will be seen that this work is altogether novel in conception; and we certainly can believe that it opens out a prospect of giving notions on grammar, which is not so easily attainable on other systems. We strongly recommend the Grammar to the attention of those who are interested in education.

LII.—*Daily Family Prayer for Churchmen. Compiled (chiefly) from the Book of Common Prayer. By W. W. How, M.A., Rector of Whittington. London: Rivingtons.*

WE are glad to see these Prayers are not *wholly* compiled wholly from the Book of Common Prayer, because family worship may need some additional matter. The volume is liturgical in its character throughout, but the author has introduced appropriate prayers and intercessions; and we will add, that those of his own composition are about the best in the book. It is really a very good and useful book.

LIII.—*Life and Death; a Series of Meditations adapted from the French of Nouet. Edited by the Rev. C. C. SPENCER, M.A., Rector of Benefield, and late Curate of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge. London: Cleaver.*

WE have no great liking for "adaptations," but at the same time we are bound to admit that the work before us appears to be less exceptionable than might have been anticipated. Of course it is full of piety and devotion, as such works usually are.

LIV.—*Polonius; a Collection of Wise Saws and Modern Instances. London: Pickering.*

THE author of this little volume has turned his reading to good account; his pages are full of instruction and amusement. Here is a specimen:—

"DATE AND DABITUR.

"There is, in Austria (said Luther), a monastery which was in former times very rich, and continued rich so long as it gave freely to the poor; but when it gave over that, then it became poor itself, and so remains to this day. Not long since, a poor man knocked at the gate and begged alms for God's sake. The porter said they were themselves too poor to give. 'And do you know why?' said the other. 'I will tell you. You had formerly in this monastery two brethren, one named DATE, and the other DABITUR. DATE you thrust out, and DABITUR went away of himself soon after.'"

LV.—*The Divine Master*. London: Masters.

THIS is one of those publications which it is not easy to speak of. Its piety deserves more than praise; but it is Roman Catholic in its whole frame, spirit, and detail. We do not say that it is offensively so, but it is clearly of that school. The pictures and illustrations are exceedingly well executed, and are just the sort of things we see in the best got up Roman Catholic books.

LVI.—*Twice-told Tales*. By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE. *Second Series*. London: Routledge.

THE second series of "Twice-told Tales," by Hawthorne, appear to be fully equal to the first; they are purely American, and deal largely in the history and manners of the Puritans of New England. There is a combination of quiet humour and pathos in these stories which reminds us sometimes of Washington Irving.

LVII.—*Theophili Episcopi Antiochensis Libri tres ad Autolycum*. *Edidit prolegomenis versione notulis indicibus instruxit* GULIELMUS GILSON HUMPHRY, *S.T.B. Coll. SS. Trin. ap. Cantabrig.* Soc. Cantabrigiæ. M.DCCC.LII.

IT is really a matter for congratulation to all Churchmen to see works of this kind make their appearance. Theophilus, sixth bishop of Antioch from the time of the Apostles, here defends the Christian religion against the objections of heathen philosophers, and points out the errors and absurdities of idolatry. It is edited with great care by Mr. Humphry, who has prefixed some introductory remarks in very pure and elegant Latinity.

LVIII.—*Homœopathy in 1851*. Edited by J. RUTHERFORD RUSSELL, *M.D.* London: Groombridge.

THIS volume is throughout controversial in its tone, and wages

deadly war with the medical profession in general. That there is something in Homœopathy is evident from the list of names of persons who conceive themselves to have derived benefits from it. Whether they have been cured by the effects of imagination, or no, it would be hard to say.

LIX.—*Welsh Sketches. By the Author of "Proposals for Christian Union."* London: Darling.

THE author of the little work before us is known by several previous publications on Christian Union. It contains an historical sketch of the Welsh Church from the time of St. Paul to the twelfth century. We are bound to add, that its statements are founded, to a considerable extent, on documents which are of no historical value whatever.

LX.—*The Mother's Legacie to her Unborne Childe. By ELIZABETH JOCELINE.* Edinburgh and London: Blackwoods.

THIS little manual is deserving of a longer notice than we can give it. It consists of a letter addressed to her husband, and another to her unborn child—but left unfinished—the pious authoress being called out of this life immediately after giving birth to her child. This truly Christian work was published in the time of James I.; it expresses, in the most touching way, the feelings of a pious mother in the prospect of parting from her husband and her child. A very interesting Introduction, including biographical notices, is prefixed.

LXI.—*Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, Titus, and the First to Timothy (in Continuation of the Work of Olshausen). By AUGUST WIESINGER. Translated by Rev. J. TRALTON, A.M.* Edinburgh: Clark.

It appears to us that this Commentary is, generally speaking, orthodox in its character. It meets the arguments of the Rationalist and Infidel critics very ably and learnedly: indeed, its tone is, in consequence, in a great degree controversial and critical. Unfortunately, it has become necessary to combat notions of this kind in England as well as in Germany.

LXII.—*The Monthly Packet of Evening Readings for Younger Members of the English Church.* Vol. II. London: Mozleys.

THIS little magazine appears to be very satisfactorily conducted. It abounds in tales and historical sketches, intermingled with

some good and useful instruction on religious subjects. We sincerely wish it all success.

LXIII.—*Sermons. By the Rev. STEUART H. PEARSON, B.D.* London: Hatchards.

A SERIES of discourses preached, for the most part, in Harrow School, and comprising Evangelical views of Scripture doctrine, in association with some of Dr. Arnold's views. The work evinces the possession of considerable power of mind, and is characterized by much elegance of style.

LXIV.—*Sermons. By the Rev. JAMES D. DIXON, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Bramley.* London: Bell.

A CLEVER and original volume of Sermons, well adapted to arrest the attention of the manufacturing population to whom they were addressed. The vigorous, straightforward, speech-like character of these Sermons is just adapted to the "north-country" mind, and the homely illustrations in which they abound will be of use to every clergyman as suggestive of ideas.

LXV.—*Sermons on the Doctrines and Means of Grace, &c. By GEORGE TREVOR, M.A., Canon of York.* London: Bell.

WE have been much pleased with all we have read of this series of Sermons. They appear to be sound and orthodox in diction; not extreme in views, though recognizing the privileges of the Christian Church. The style is excellent, and altogether the discourses exhibit more than ordinary thought and knowledge.

LXVI.—*Far off; or, Asia and Australia described. With Anecdotes and numerous Illustrations. By the Author of "The Peep of Day," &c.* Second Thousand. London: Hatchards. [Fcp. pp. 316.]

WE have sometimes met clergymen who are in the habit of endeavouring to promote the missionary cause in their parishes, who would be thankful for such a little book as this. It seems to us just the sort of book that might be read out to a class of young persons either in national schools or otherwise, and which would be certain to interest them excessively. It is full of little stories about missionary work, or about the state of religion in the East and in other heathen lands. And if the countries were pointed out on a map, we can hardly imagine a more pleasing

exercise than such a book would provide. It would also provide materials for missionary lectures or addresses.

LXVII.—*Gentle Influence; or, the Cousin's Visit.* By FRANCES M. LEVETT, Author of "*Consolation*," &c. London: Masters.

A REALLY pleasing and unexceptionable little book. It describes the effect of example and gentle influence in subduing hard-hearted and worldly people, and bringing them to better things.

LXVIII.—*The Pious Churchman: a Manual of Devotion and Spiritual Instruction.* Edinburgh: Lendrum. London: Masters.

THOSE persons who like a manual of instruction which, without being actually Roman Catholic, makes the nearest approximation in style and matter to Romanism that well can be, without being actually the very thing itself, will admire this little book.

LXIX.—*The Three Paths; or, Truth, Vanity, and Profession.* By the Hon. Mrs. ANDERSON. In 2 Vols. London: Rivingtons.

A HIGHLY aristocratic tale, in which the reader may expatiate at pleasure on the habits, manners, marriages, opinions, and connexions of dukes, and marquises, and marchionesses without end. Piety appears in this tale always surrounded with wealth and high connexions; craft and worldliness are always vulgar and low-bred. Were it not for this adulation of wealth and rank, we should like the book well enough, for its style is very good, and there is much good sense in many parts.

LXX.—*Meditations and Vows, &c.* By JOSEPH HALL, D.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter, and afterwards Bishop of Norwich. London: Pickering.

A REPRINT in a very small form of one of Bishop Hall's well-known works, full of his quaint and pointed apophthegms.

LXXI.—*The Exiled Soul.* London: Masters.

THIS tale is a translation from the French, and is purely French in style and manner. Its scene is laid in the second century in Judæa. A young girl is restored to life by miracle; but having tasted of happiness beyond this world, she is as an exile here below, and is released from the ties of earthly love by being again permitted to die. The idea is striking, but it is rather overstrained.

LXXII.—*Sermons preached at Bognor. By the Rev. EDWARD MILLER, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, Perpetual Curate of St. John's Chapel, Bognor, in the County of Sussex. Second Series.* London: Rivingtons.

WE think the people of Bognor are fortunate in possessing so able and sound a preacher as the author of this volume. His discourses exhibit a great felicity in illustration, and in application to all the varied circumstances of our own times. They are written in a style of great vigour and animation, and the preacher is evidently at home in addressing congregations of the educated classes. We consider his Sermons on Special Occasions, of which there are several in this collection, as indicating great fertility of resource and originality of conception. Altogether this is a very instructive volume of Sermons, which will furnish many good hints to the clergy as to the manner of treating subjects.

LXXIII.—*The Spirit and Scope of Education in promoting the Well-being of Society. From the German of the Very Rev. J. A. STAPF, D.D., by ROBERT GORDON.* Edinburgh: Marsh and Beattie. London: Dolman.

THIS is a Roman Catholic work, and will doubtless be prized by persons of that persuasion. There are useful practical remarks in it, but little that strikes us as new or deserving of special notice.

LXXIV.—*Lives of certain Fathers of the Church. By the Author of "Tales of Kirkbeck," &c. Edited by the Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A.* Vol. III. London: Masters.

THESE lives are introduced by a Preface from the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, of which the following is an extract:—

"Follow St. Cyril; see how schism and division rent the Church asunder. Those who had no right to assume the offices of the Church presumed to set themselves forward. Pretenders to power, and pretenders to the interpretation of doctrine, were rising up on all sides. St. Cyril comes forward as the defender of the faith, and proclaims Catholicity as the only test of truth. 'If ever,' he says, 'thou art sojourning in any city, inquire not simply where the Lord's House is (for the sects of the profane also make an attempt to call their own dens houses of the Lord), nor merely where the *Church* is, but *where is the Catholic Church?*' What would St. Cyril have said *now*, when the 'sects of the profane' are in almost every street, and when our people have within the last year at their public county meetings, all but universally denied the Catholic faith, and assumed that their Church is '*Protestant*;'

not meaning, in its proper sense, that which the Church of England may rightly be called, but positively meaning, that they repudiate, and cast out, and ignore the very idea of being Catholic at all? Alas! yes; and bishops too have been found to join in the assertion of '*Protestant faith*,' thereby fraternizing with Dissenters and 'sects of the profane.' It will refresh us somewhat to turn away from these sad recollections to a better age and spirit, less compromising with their enemy the world."—p. viii.

The Lives of the Fathers comprised in this volume are of the third and fourth centuries. They are very well told in as popular a style as can well be.

LXXV.—*Bishop Pearson's Five Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles, and Annals of St. Paul. Edited in English, with a few Notes, by J. R. CROWFOOT, B.D., Lecturer on Divinity in King's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: Deighton. London: J. W. Parker. [12mo. pp. 112.]*

THE object of the editor of this little work of Bishop Pearson is to render it more generally accessible to the clergy, and to direct the attention of Roman Catholics and Dissenters to the original constitution of the Christian Church, as described in these invaluable works. We should say that the volume before us is one which might be made very useful in any parish where it was desirable to lend books on such subjects. It meets the Romish arguments.

LXXVI.—*The Songs of the Bells, and other Poems. By the Rev. JAMES DIXON, B.D., Curate of Cliburn, Westmoreland. London: Groombridge.*

THE Songs of the Bells are a series of thoughts and descriptions connected with the service of the Church of England. The author is unmistakeably a poet. We must quote the following beautiful lines in proof of our position:—

“ Fresh vapours from the meads arise,
And hang their folds upon the skies;
All things their winter slumber break,
And into gladsome life awake;
The savage spirit of the mountains
Is melted in the vernal beam;
And from its far and frozen fountains
Flows freshly forth the valley's stream,
Whose wimpling waters like to silver gleam.

“ And hark ! from out the church’s tower,
Which leafy ivy-wreaths embower,
One bell strikes loud its mellow tongue,
Whose sweet voice through the vales is flung ;
And from the ancient portal come
The villagers in close array,
Breaking away unto their home,
Through fragrant lane and grassy way,
As glad and cheerful as the opening May !

“ Ring, ring still on, ye ancient bells !
How gladsome through the distant dells,
And o’er the hills and silent lakes,
Your music at the morning breaks,
On Sunday or on holiday !
Peace, as we listen, like a dew
Of nectar fills the soul alway ;
Calm as the heaven’s silent blue,
Our spirits wear an everlasting hue.”—pp. 19, 20.

• This is really beautiful, with the exception of the three concluding lines of the last stanza. We commend the volume to all who love the old parish churches of England, and their sacred associations.

LXXVII.—*Babylon and Jerusalem: a Letter addressed to* IDA, COUNTESS OF HAHN-HAHN. *From the German. With a Preface by the Translator.* London: J. W. Parker.

IDA, COUNTESS OF HAHN-HAHN, appears to be one of those persons who, having lived a long life without religion, or in utter neglect of the religion professed, and having lived upon a fame which is becoming extinct, seek to gain celebrity again by a total change of religious opinions, founded on sentiment, not on the investigation of truth. We have unfortunately seen too much of this sort of thing. The author of this book (Dr. Nitsch) most ably replies to the Countess, and at the same time discloses the unsatisfactory state of the Protestant Churches in Germany.

LXXVIII.—*Sermons preached at the Chapel of the Guild of the Holy Cross, Stratford-upon-Avon. By the Rev. T. R. MEDWIN, M.A., Minister of the Chapel, and Head Master of the Grammar School.* London: Bell.

THIS series of discourses is characterized by much piety and soundness of doctrine. The author is remote from extremes in theology ; and his discourses promote the spirit of attachment to the Church, and to the religion which she inculcates.

LXXIX.—1. *Chaldee Reading Lessons, consisting of the whole of the Biblical Chaldee, with a Grammatical Praxis, and an Interlineary Translation.* London: Bagster. [12mo. pp. 140.]

2. *Syriac Reading Lessons, &c.* Bagster. [12mo. pp. xxxvi. 87.]

THE former of these publications contains all the Chaldee portions of the Bible, with a grammatical explanation of every word. The latter includes the elements of Syriac Grammar. Both may be recommended as most convenient manuals to students of these languages.

LXXX.—*On the State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity. Part II.* London: Pickering.

A VERY able sketch of Church history from the times of Arianism to the end of the sixth century. The author is well acquainted with his subject, and has condensed the chief points into a very small compass. His opinions, however, are not merely anti-Romish, but strongly tinged with modern liberalism, as is evident from his mode of dealing with the Arian and Pelagian controversies.

LXXXI.—*The Poetical Works of James Russell Lowell. Edited, with an Introduction, by ANDREW S. SCOBLE.* London: Routledge. [18mo. pp. 334.]

THIS is one of that extremely cheap series of the American poets now publishing by Mr. Routledge, and will probably be regarded as not the least valuable amongst them. Mr. Lowell is one of the younger American poets, and his productions, in some cases, evince some of the characteristics of a very young and ardent writer, who composes with facility. The lyric form of poetry appears to be that which is best adapted to the peculiar character of his genius; and in the volume before us we possess many beautiful and varied productions, evidencing the possession of a cultivated intellect and an inventive imagination.

LXXXII.—*A Catechism on the Services of the Church of England. By the Rev. S. W. DOWELL, Vicar of Gosfield, Essex.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS Catechism, which extends to 224 pages, 12mo, is chiefly compiled from Bishop Mant on the Common Prayer, Pearson on the Creed, Waterland on the Athanasian Creed, Wheatley on the Common Prayer. It also proves, by texts from the Scripture, the truth of the doctrine contained in the Prayer Book. Altogether it appears to be a very complete commentary in a catechetical form.

I.XXXIII.—*Were Heretics ever burned alive at Rome? A Report of the Proceedings in the Roman Inquisition against Fulgentio Manfredi, &c. By the Rev. RICHARD GIBBINGS, M.A., Rector of Raymunterdoney, in the Diocese of Raphoe.* London: Pethe-ram. [8vo. pp. 56.]

THE "Dublin Review" having stated, in June, 1850, that the Roman Inquisition has never been known to order a capital punishment, Mr. Gibbings here produces the Proceedings against Fulgentio Manfredi from the original documents, with the sentence condemning him as a relapsed heretic, and handing him over to the civil power, recommending him to mercy at the same time—the regular form used when a heretic is to be burned. The perusal of this publication is enough to make one shudder, at the cold-blooded cruelty and ferocity which breathe throughout the proceedings. Such is the system which now seeks to gain ascendancy in this Protestant empire!

I.XXXIV.—*An Essay on Confession, Penance, and Absolution. By Mr. ROGER LAURENCE, a Layman of Queen Anne's Time.* London: Masters.

THIS tract is published with a view of showing that the doctrines on confession now put forward are not novel, and that a layman has been found to advocate it—and a layman, too, who was opposed to Rome. We do not see the force of the argument, we own. Mr. Laurence's opinion is, that confession is lawful and necessary under certain circumstances: this is admitted by every one. But the objection to the system now being introduced is not that it teaches the propriety, or fitness, or even necessity of confessing, under certain circumstances, but that it practically makes it necessary in all the cases in which the Church of Rome requires it, and is conducted in the same way, and on the same principles as the Roman Catholic auricular confession.

LXXXV.—*Zingra, the Gipsy. By ANNETTE MARIE MAILLARD.* London: Routledge.

THIS is a tale of great power and enthralling interest. The Gipsy is a noble creature, and we are rejoiced at the reward which virtue receives. The moral of the tale is excellent.

I.XXXVI.—*The Nourishment of the Christian Soul; or, Mental Prayer rendered Easy, by Meditation on the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. With Exercises and Prayers. From the French of Pinart.* London: Masters.

THIS is a Roman Catholic work, edited, we see, by a Scotch
VOL. XVII.—NO. XXXIV.—JULY, 1852. H h

bishop, who places his initials to a work which speaks of the "*adorable sacrament*" (p. 45). We need offer little comment, further than that we do not wonder at the reports which were lately circulated—that the editor had joined the Church of Rome.

LXXXVII.—*Approach to the Holy Altar; by Bishop KEN. From his "Manual of Prayer," and "Practice of Divine Love."* London: Pickering.

WHAT more can any Churchman need than is to be found in works like those of Bishop Ken? What good can result from adopting the devotions of those the first article of whose faith is transubstantiation, and the great act of their worship, the worship of the Eucharist? There is, we fear, little use in arguing with those who act thus: the time for argument seems to have passed. We are, however, thankful to the editor of this selection from Bishop Ken, and trust that so good work will be as useful as it is evidently well intended.

LXXXVIII.—*The Political Experience of the Ancients, in its Bearing upon Modern Times. By HUGH SEYMOUR TREMENEERE.* London: Murray. [Fcap. pp. 136.]

THE position of the author as commissioner under an Act of Parliament relating to the mining districts, having led him to observe the great amount of false theories on government, connected with Socialism, which are in circulation amongst the middling classes, he has, in the little volume before us, brought together the substance of the works written on these topics by Aristotle, Polybius, and Cicero, with a view to furnish an antidote to the evil. This compilation appears to be most ably executed.

LXXXIX.—*A Gift at Confirmation; a Selection of Poems illustrative of the Service. Edited by the Author of "Aids to Development," &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS little manual comprises a selection of poetry chiefly from old writers, adapted to all the parts of the Confirmation Service. The Introduction contains some good remarks on Confirmation and the Lord's Supper.

XC.—*England before the Norman Conquest. By the Author of "Domestic Scenes in Greenland and Iceland," &c.* London: Van Voorst.

AN amusing and instructive little work, well adapted to engage the interest of children.

XCI.—*Murray's Readings for the Rail.* London: Murray.

A CHARMING collection of cheap and instructive publications. Here the reader will find many of the choicest articles from the "Quarterly Review," in the shape of shilling volumes, illustrated with engravings; books of voyages and travels, &c. The last we have seen were "Oliphant's Journey to Nepaul," and "Deeds of Naval Daring," each of which comprises, for the small sum of half-a-crown, a large amount of amusement and instruction.

XCII.—*The Messiahship of Jesus. The concluding Series of Twelve (Warburtonian) Lectures on the Prophecies, &c. By A. McCaul, D.D., &c.* London: Parker.

THE object of this Series is to meet the objections of Strauss to the authenticity of the Scriptures; to point out the agreement between the life of Christ and the prophecies, to meet the Jewish objections from unfulfilled prophecy, and to distinguish from each other the prophecies which refer to the two advents of Christ. Dr. McCaul is an able reasoner, and is fully competent to undertake the discussion of these important topics.

XCIII.—*The Patriarch of the Nile; or, Truth Triumphant. A Poem, in Two Cantos. By J. D. Pigott.* London: Rivingtons.

THE scene of this poem is laid in Egypt and in Syria, during the reign of Julian the Apostate. It portrays the exile of the great Athanasius, the attempt to rebuild Jerusalem and the miracle which arrested it, the expedition of Julian and its fatal result, and the restoration of the Nicene Faith on the accession of Jovian. Subordinately to the general plan we have a tale of Christian love, in which Alethe, a maiden to whom the great Athanasius had acted as a parent, is at length united, after many trials, to a deacon of the Church of Alexandria. The general tone and spirit of this work in theological questions is far remote from any tendencies to Romanism, to which the writer is a firm opponent, while he is cordially attached to the doctrine and discipline of the English Church. We must select a few examples of his mode of treating the subject. The following is the description of Athanasius:—

"An old man knelt in a lonely spot,
As the sun went down on a famous land;
'Twas a palm o'ershading a low-brow'd grot,
Where the mountain slop'd to the desert-sand.

Nor far remote a city lay,
 Suffus'd with the light of the dying day ;
 That reflected stream'd on that ancient's head,
 As he fronted the East o' th' horizon red ;
 But his face was shrouded, as silent there
 With a statue's calm he was rapt in prayer ;
 And his locks and beard were silver-gray,
 Where seventy winters had had their sway.
 But wait till at length his eyes were rais'd,
 And hands no less, as he upward gaz'd,
 And o'er that aspect thus subdued,
 Where strife nor passion dared to brood,
 Ye mark'd how stern resolve sat high,
 How couch'd a fearless energy !"—p. 9.

We can speak strongly of the interest and gratification we have derived from the perusal of this poem. The author is possessed of very considerable power of imagination, and his composition reminds us frequently of Mr. Bandinel's "Lufra," on which we had recently occasion to comment ; and to which it certainly approximates very nearly in poetical merit, as it does in general sentiments.

xciv.—*The Life of Cardinal Wolsey. By GEORGE CAVENDISH, his Gentleman Usher. A New Edition.* London: Rivingtons. [Sm. 4to. pp. xi. 285.]

If any of our readers should not have perused Cavendish's *Life of Wolsey*, we would recommend them to buy this beautiful book ; and we feel assured that, after a perusal, they will allot to it an honourable place in their libraries. It is very carefully edited by Mr. Holmes, of the British Museum, who has prefixed some account of the author's life. This curious and valuable work was first published in 1641, but was reprinted in that century, and in the year 1706, and was inserted in the *Harleian Miscellany* ; and subsequently in Dr. Wordsworth's "*Ecclesiastical Biography*," where it is found in a more accurate form than in any previous edition. Mr. Holmes has illustrated the present edition with copious notes on antiquarian and historical subjects ; which very greatly add to its value, while they contribute to establish the fidelity and accuracy of the original work. The value and importance of this work consists in its details of matters in Church and State at the period when the Reformation commenced in England, and its most curious and graphic description of manners and habits at that time.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AMONGST the pamphlets now before us we may mention "The Manchester and Salford Education Bill (Mr. Entwisle's and the Rev. Hugh Stowell's) Infidel in its Principle," &c. (Simpkin and Marshall), as an able and caustic publication; a "New Medical Dictionary for the People," by Dr. Thompson (Groombridge), very cheap; "Asylums for the Insane," by T. Dickson, L.R.C.S.E. (Churchill), containing practical suggestions for improving Lunatic Asylums; "A Letter to the Society of Arts, on Elementary Education in Design," by D. R. Hay (Blackwood's), suggesting the expediency of teaching the elements of drawing in parochial schools; "Narrative of the Kaffir War," by R. Godlinton and E. Irving (Richardson), a curious and interesting history. We would also mention an excellent "Charge," by the Bishop of Guiana, 1851 (Rivingtons); also a "Charge" of the Bishop of Tasmania, in the Cathedral of Hobart Town, 27th May, 1851, containing much interesting detail as to the lamentable differences which have arisen in that diocese; a "Report of the Proceedings of the Special Convention of the Diocese of New Jersey," March 17, 1851, in which three bishops, who had written a letter reflecting on Bishop Doane, were censured; Bishop Doane's "Sermon on the Death of Dr. Croswell;" his "Protest, Appeal, and Reply," his "Conventional Sermon," and his "Lecture on the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge;" a "Letter" from the Bishop of Sydney to Dr. Wiseman (Rivingtons), very ably refuting certain attacks of Dr. Wiseman on the Sec of Sydney, and convicting him of quoting again from spurious writings of the Fathers—Dr. W. is really an incorrigible offender in this respect; "A Letter to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone," on his proposed measure for the Colonial Church, by a Dignitary of that Church (Hatchard), opposed to Synods.

A very curious, ingenious, and learned pamphlet, by Sir G. Rose (Hatchard), entitled, "The Affghans, the Ten Tribes, and the Kings of the East, the Druses the Moabites," tracing the Ten Tribes and the Moabites as still existing, is well worthy of attention. Rev. J. Spurell's pamphlet, "Miss Sellon and the Sisters of Mercy" (Hatchards), and the "Reply" of the Superior (Masters), disclose a deplorable state of things. We have to commend "Four Sermons on the Deity and Incarnation" of our Lord, by Rev. B. Wilson (Rivingtons); "A Sermon," by Lord Arthur Hervy, at the Jubilee of the Society for the Promotion of the Gospel, at Ely; "Witnesses to the Truth," a Sermon by C. J. Vaughan, D.D.; Dr. Wordsworth's Jubilee Sermon; "The Revelations of Astronomy," a Sermon by Rev. T. H. Steel,

M.A.; "Church Synods the Institution of Christ," by G. Trevor, M.A.; "Confirmation," a Sermon by Rev. R. W. Barton (Hope); "Deserters from the Congregation," by C. J. Vaughan, D.D.; "The Ministry of Reconciliation," a Sermon by Rev. E. T. Vaughan, M.A.; "The Planting of Nations a great Responsibility," a Sermon by the Bishop of Oxford; "The Leaven of the Kingdom of God," a Sermon by the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Lyttelton; "The Crimes of the Lower Classes," by Rev. J. C. Cox (Rivingtons); Dr. Wordsworth's "Occasional Sermons," including an interesting account of the Early Irish Church.

We may also mention Sermons by Rev. H. T. Wilmshurst, on Church subjects; by Rev. E. Stuart, on the Pew System; by Rev. C. Dodgson, on "Ritual Worship," with a Letter in Defence of it.

Amongst other publications we may mention an able pamphlet by the Rev. W. B. Flower, on "Non-Episcopal Orders," in reply to Mr. Goode's publication; a useful pamphlet on "The Law, Constitution, and Reform of Convocation;" "The Report of the Ruri-Decanal Chapter of Leeds," an important document; "How can we have Three Services?" by Mr. Stracey (Masters); a Letter to the Bishop of Aberdeen on the Proposal to admit the Laity into Synods; "Lectures on Church History," by Rev. J. R. Woodford, an able Summary; "Synodal Action necessary to the Church," by Rev. H. Caswall; "England as it is, and as it might be," by Justus Wild—a proposal to pay off the National Debt; "Sayings and Doings of the Lord Bishop of Manchester," by Rev. E. Fellows, and "Trials of a Minister," by Rev. A. D. Campbell—complaints of ill-treatment; "Apostolical Succession and Canon LV.," by Rev. W. R. Scott; A Judgment at Armagh in the Case of Stewart *v.* Crommelin, by Rev. H. Irwin; Letter to the Parishioners of St. Saviour's, Leeds, by the Vicar; "Propugnacula," by Aug. Guest, LL.D., a plan for establishing Colleges of Clergy in large Parishes, &c. &c.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

EUROPE.

FRANCE.—The efforts in France to suppress Protestantism, or at least to prevent its possession of the most ordinary advantages, are unceasing. No congregation is permitted to erect a chapel without the consent of the authorities. A *firman* has to be demanded, as in Turkey; and it is often refused. We find in the "L'Ami de la Religion" that the Protestants of Nantes are petitioning for the erection of a new temple for their worship. The protests against this measure are numerous and energetic. They are founded chiefly on the small number of Protestants, who are only 387 out of 100,000 people; on their having already a church for them more than sufficient; and on the majority of them being foreigners. What number of Romish chapels would there now be in England, if a similar opposition were sanctioned here? The extraordinary lengths to which intolerance is carried in France by the Government officials appears from the fact that Protestant journals are not now permitted even to state the *fact* that conversions take place in this country from the error of Romanism. A journal, published in the west of France, was lately warned to abstain from stating facts of this nature.

On the other hand, the policy of the Government of Louis Napoleon is to gratify in every way the Church of Rome. Hence the Prelates are treated with the utmost distinction on all occasions. No ceremonial of importance takes place in which that prelacy does not occupy the leading place. The installation of the President, the distribution of eagles to the army, are presided over by the Prelates of the Roman Church, surrounded with splendour and magnificence.

The salaries of all French Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops, and of Canons and Choirs, have been largely augmented. Great sums are expended by the State in the repair and decoration of the Roman Catholic churches. Four new bishoprics have been founded in the colonies.

The French Ambassador has been instructed to demand from the Porte great concessions in favour of the Roman Catholics in the East, so as to give them the preference, in many respects, to the Greek and Oriental Christians. These concessions were insisted on with the utmost pertinacity, and yielded almost to force. Facts like this prove that the French President is, in his policy, a violent and intolerant

Romanist; and that the Church of Rome has, at this moment, the most complete influence in France that it has possessed since the days of Louis XIV. and the *dragonnades*.

The President of the Republic having restored the church of St. Geneviève to its original uses, and constituted a Chapter for its service, the Archbishop of Paris has nominated a jury of ecclesiastics for the purpose of examining candidates for the office of Chaplain, whose especial qualification is to consist in pulpit eloquence. The *relics* of St. Geneviève are also to hold a conspicuous place in the restored Church, as a means of grace.

A fête, on a grand scale, is preparing at Cambray, in honour of the fourth secular anniversary of the reception of the image of Notre Dame de Grace, believed to have been sculptured by St. Luke the Evangelist, and given to Cambray, A.D. 1452. Vast numbers of Bishops are expected from France, Belgium, and elsewhere, and, amongst the rest, we see, Dr. Wiseman.

The Bishop of Luçon is engaged in visitation in La Vendée. He has visited a parish every day for some time. The churches are full, and hundreds of the people come to communion, administered by him. This is deserving of praise.

The Abbé Barthier, Canon of the Cathedral of Toulouse, being unable, after two years' labour, to raise funds for an asylum, where young women, condemned to imprisonment, before the age of sixteen, may be received and instructed, has, at length, sought and obtained an *indulgence* for all who contribute to this object. It is thus that almost all works of charity in the Church of Rome are made dependent on the doctrine of Purgatory.

The "Univers" has the following paragraph on the *Mois de Marie*:—

"Information from various quarters tells us of the zeal with which the soldiery follow the exercises of the *Mois de Marie*. Devotion to the Holy Virgin has always been particularly dear to the soldiery: and, wherever a privileged sanctuary of the Mother of God exists, they love to assemble there, and give themselves up under her protection to the various exercises of prayer which constitute what is termed '*L'Œuvre des Militaires*.' At *Notre Dame de Fourvière*, at Lyons, especially, two or three hundred soldiers often come in the evening before entering barracks, to pray to and sing praises in common in honour of Mary. These *Œuvres des Militaires* are now established in almost every town, we might say, in almost every regiment of France."

The Pope has granted to the Bishop of Arras (Mgr. Parisi) the personal privilege of wearing the *pallium*, in consideration of his services to the "Catholic" Church, especially his writings for the restoration of "Catholic" schools in France; and his votes in the National Assembly for sending the troops of France to the defence of the Papal See.

A decree of the Prince President orders a Chaplain to be appointed

to every ship bearing an admiral's flag, or commanding a naval division, and to all vessels sent on a warlike expedition. The Chaplain's salary is to be from 2000fr. to 25000fr.; and he is to sit at the table of the commanding officer. A head Chaplain to the navy has likewise been appointed with a salary of 6000fr.

A controversy is going on between the "Univers" and the "Gazette de France," as to the propriety of declaring the "Immaculate Conception" of the Virgin an article of the faith, in accordance with the Papal encyclic, issued with that view by Pius IX., during his exile at Gaeta. Certain "respectable Prelates," it appears, have expressed a fear, lest "it might expose the Church to fresh calumnies, as though she fabricated new doctrines;" and the Gallicans of the "Gazette de France" ask, "Can the Church propose new doctrines?" In reply, the "Univers" expresses its astonishment at the audacity of the "Gazette de France" in insinuating that the Vicar of Jesus Christ could propose to all the Bishops of the world to do with their concurrence what the Church had no right to do; or that an immense majority of the Episcopate could give its consent; and winds up with the conclusive argument, that "a new doctrine" is a contradiction in terms; and that, therefore, what the Church declares to be a "doctrine," cannot be "new."

The Bishop of Viviers has addressed to the Minister of Public Instruction in France a pathetic remonstrance against the indecency of State Inspectors visiting ecclesiastical institutions under his episcopal superintendence, especially the houses of more than 2000 *religieuses* under his jurisdiction. "The complaints of these poor sisters," says the Bishop, "reach me from all sides, and I see their vocation sensibly diminished. Is it not something shocking, almost immoral, that men—sometimes young men—should make long and minute inspections through schools of girls conducted by *religieuses*? Many of these assure me, with *naïveté*, that there is no penance so rude but they would impose it on themselves to escape the torture of one of these visits."

The Bishop of Orleans has placed the "Univers" under an interdict in his diocese on account of an attack made by that journal upon the charge of the Bishop, who vindicated the use of the classics in the *petits séminaires*. The "Bulletin Evangélique de la Basse-Bretagne," a Protestant journal, having stated that, "on the first Sunday in February, five persons abjured the errors of Roman Catholicism in the Free Church of the Canongate of Edinburgh," the editor has, at the instigation of the Priesthood, been warned by the Prefect of Finisterre "to abstain from attacks on "the religion, which is that of an immense majority in the country."

On the occasion of the *Fête Dieu*, the law, which prohibits Roman Catholic processions in the streets in all places where there is a Protestant church, has been violated in many instances, by the connivance of the authorities, the present Government of France being evidently determined to give all possible encouragement to the Popish priesthood.

GERMANY.—The Austrian Government has placed itself entirely in the hands of the Church of Rome, and takes every opportunity to oppress those who differ from her. Not content with closing the chapels of the German Catholics, it has expelled Protestant missionaries to the Jews. On the other hand, the Church of Rome gains all it seeks. The Primate of Hungary has lately been at Vienna to treat on the subject of ecclesiastical revenues: this question has been settled as the Church desires. The Minister of worship has granted to fourteen Episcopal seminaries in Hungary an annual sum of 49,000 florins.

It has been recently stated that the proportion of Protestants and Roman Catholics in Germany are as follows:—Under six Roman Catholic Governments, 13,328,204 Roman Catholics, 3,022,114 Protestants; under thirty-two Protestant Governments, 6,081,964 Roman Catholics, 13,884,077 Protestants. Thus Romanism is rather in the majority in Germany. Prussia had, in (1840,) eight millions of Protestants, five millions of Roman Catholics, three millions of Jews. By virtue of the Concordat of 1821, there are in Prussia the following Roman Catholic Bishops:—1. Archbishop of Posen; 2. Bishop of Breslau; 3. Bishop of Ermeland; 4. Archbishop of Cologne; 5. Bishop of Munster; 6. Bishop of Treves; 7. Bishop of Paderburn.

The following extracts from a letter, dated Vienna, March 12, appear in a contemporary journal:—

“Religious toleration in Austria has been further illustrated by a Ministerial edict forbidding the meetings of the Anabaptists in certain of the Crown lands that are not named. The measure corresponds with those already mentioned, for the suppression of the Scriptures, and the expulsion of the Scotch missionaries from Gallicia and Hungary. . . . Another seizure has been made of 900 Bibles, the property of the British and Foreign Bible Society, who have two printing establishments in Hungary—the principal one at Guns. The printing-office has been forcibly closed, and the publication of the sacred volume interdicted by order of Government. . . . The property belonging to the British and Foreign Bible Society in the different provinces of Austria is estimated somewhere between 3000*l.* and 4000*l.*”

According to official reports, 648 persons renounced Catholicism and embraced Protestantism in Silesia last year:—

“Of these 648 persons, 269 were adults, and the remainder had already been confirmed. Independently of these, 466 Roman Catholic parents had their children baptized in the Protestant Church in the year 1851. These figures are higher in comparison than in the previous year 1850, for in the official list for that year only 308 converts were entered, of whom 159 were adults. In that year also, only 187 children of Roman Catholic parents were baptized in the Protestant Church of Silesia. It appears that many persons who had joined the so-called German Catholic Churches are now going over to the Protestant Churches, on account of the great obstacles which have been put in the way of the German Catholics.”

GREECE.—The “*Trieste Gazette*” has the following, from Athens:

—The attention of the Government is at present engaged on a very serious affair; it proposes to conclude with the Patriarch of Constantinople a treaty which will completely change the relations of the Greek Church, which had declared itself independent of Constantinople since the establishment of a kingdom, and which had for its chief a synod chosen by the king. By the new treaty the Greek Church will cease to be an independent member of the dogma of Anatolia, and will return under the full and entire authority of the patriarch.

ITALY.—His Eminence Cardinal Mattei, Bishop of Frascati, and Archpriest of St. Peter's, has left Rome for Naples, to attend the coronation of the image of the Virgin at Capurso.

The Bishop of Samos *in partibus* Vicar Apostolic of Japan, who has been for some years at Hong Kong, waiting for an opportunity of penetrating into Japan, has returned to Rome, bringing the Acts of a Synod held in China by five Roman Catholic Vicars Apostolic in China, attended by thirty priests.

On the 15th ult., the Pope held a public Consistory, in which he created six Cardinals, publishing four, and reserving two *in petto*. One of the four is the Archbishop of Bordeaux, the other three are Italian Prelates. Appointments were made for four sees in Italy, one in Portugal, three in France, four in Austria, one in Brazil, and four *in partibus infidelium*. A secret Consistory was afterwards held, in which appointments were made to seven sees in Italy, five in Spain, one in Russia, one in Mexico, and two *in partibus infidelium*. The notice of the appointments of certain Cardinals to the Congregation of the Inquisition describes that body as "the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition."

A correspondent of the "Times" gives the following account of English churches and services in the principal cities of Italy:—

"The building at Rome is situated a few doors without the Porta del Popolo, on the road to Florence, in immediate and convenient vicinity to the Strangers' Quarter. There is no external indication whatever of a place of worship. The apartment used as a church occupies the top of a large house, literally in the roof, the beams of which appear in several places. There is a small inclosure for the altar, and the pulpit and reading desk are placed beside it. The congregation are seated on chairs, which are pretty closely packed. The congregation is generally large, often exceeding 700 persons, and there are great complaints of want of ventilation, and excessive heat from the roof. In consequence of the dispute between the Bishop of Gibraltar and the committee, his lordship, during his last visit, did not enter 'the room known as the English chapel,' but had Divine Service performed in a house in the Corso occupied by another clergyman.

"It seems a principle throughout Italy that there shall be no external indications of an ecclesiastical character in connexion with Protestant churches. The condition is insisted upon at Nice, Genoa, Pisa, Naples, and Florence. At Nice, the building was expressly erected for

the purpose, on the condition that it should not look like a church. The pulpit is over the communion table, and is entered by a door from a staircase in the vestry. The congregation is large in the winter season. At Genoa the arrangements are of the humblest kind. The church is a room on the one pair floor of a house in a bye street. The congregation is small. At Pisa a large house has recently been built, half of which forms the dwelling for the clergyman, and the other half the church. At Naples the church is a very large and handsome room in the Consul's house, conveniently arranged and pewed. The Chaplain, who is appointed by the Embassy, is at variance with the committee, and the school in it is entirely without his control. The congregation is large and respectable. The services are never attended by the Ambassador, though the Foreign Office claims the patronage. At Florence the church is large and elegant. The altar is placed in a circular recess, with the pulpit and reading desk on either side. The roof is arched, and there is a very handsome organ loft. In all cases it appears the rule, that whatever is raised by subscription or donation of the visitors and residents for the support of worship according to the Church of England, is doubled by the Foreign Office."

A letter from Florence states that the Grand Duke has determined to abolish all the laws of Leopold I., and to restore the clergy to all the privileges they enjoyed in the beginning of the eighteenth century. This has led to a ministerial crisis. M. Bucella is to form a cabinet.

The following is an extract of a letter from Florence, dated 9th of June:—"Yesterday, at three o'clock, the decision in the case of poor Madiai and Pasquale Casacci was pronounced with closed doors. You will be sorry to learn that Madiai has been sentenced to the galleys, with hard labour, for four years and a half, and his wife to three years and ten months' imprisonment in the Ergastolo (the galleys for females), with hard labour, besides having to bear the whole expense of their trial, and being subjected to three years' *surveillance* on their liberation. Casacci, who turned *récusant*, has been discharged by the Court of Criminal law, but is detained to answer two processes against him by the police under the law of April, 1851. That history may pronounce upon the chief actors in this affair, I may state that Nervini was president of the court, Cocchi was the examining judge, Biechierai acted as Procurator-General. The trial lasted four days. Rosa (Mme. Madiai) was pale and somewhat agitated upon her appearing in court. François (Madiai) was delighted to see his wife, and shook her warmly by the hand. Everybody was astonished at their composure. Casacci was the very picture of misery, and from my heart I pitied him. At the commencement of the trial François was asked if he was born in the bosom of the Holy Mother Roman Catholic Church. 'Yes,' was his reply; 'but now I am a Christian according to the Gospel.' 'Who made you so, and have you taken an act of abjuration in the presence of those with whom you are now connected?' 'My convictions are of many years' standing, but they have acquired greater force by my study of God's Word; but what has passed between God and myself in secret

I have publicly testified by my communion in the Swiss Church.' In reply to the questions put to her, Rosa answered that she had not lightly changed her religion, and merely to please men; that, having been resident in England for sixteen years she had read much of God's Word, and compared it with the doctrines of the Romish Church; that, becoming convinced of the errors of that Church, she had left it, and had at the Communion of the Lord's Supper made a public profession of her abjuration at the time when the laws of the country allowed and protected full liberty of religion to the citizens. The audience were much struck with the simplicity and sincerity of Madiai. During the two following days witnesses were examined, and the Procurator-General concluded, demanding their conviction. On the fourth day the court remained in deliberation for a considerable time, the opinions being divided—two were in favour of an acquittal, and three for condemnation. Madiai and his wife heard the sentence with firmness and dignity. The voice of the President trembled as he read the sentence. The public were indignant at the sentence, and against the judges, full of sympathy and esteem for the Madiai, and contempt for Casacci. Madiai has been advised to appeal to the Court of Cassation, and perhaps the Superior Court, more free to act, will reverse the sentence. Landucci, the Minister of the Interior, having been applied to, has advised an application to be made for a commutation of their sentence into banishment."

SWITZERLAND.—The Roman Catholics of Geneva having lately been desirous of making a public manifestation in favour of M. Marilley, the turbulent Bishop of Lausanne, that prelate having apparently learned some discretion from the results of his former proceedings, dissuaded them from the attempt.

ASIA.

It is stated that the Rev. F. T. M'Dougal, who will be the first Bishop of Borneo, and will be consecrated so soon as the arrangements for the formation of the bishopric are completed, was formerly a medical gentleman attached to King's College Hospital. Mr. M'Dougal entered into holy orders a few years since, and proceeded as missionary to Sarawak. He appears to owe his promotion to the strong recommendation of Sir James Brooke.

The differences between the Bishop of Colombo and some of his clergy, which have been repeatedly hinted at, appear to have arisen out of the refusal of the bishop and a portion of the clergy to concur in the remonstrance of the archdeacon and another portion of the clergy against the, at least apparent, sanction given by the Government to idolatry. It seems that in the treaty made with the Kandians, on the cession of their country to the British Crown, it was stipulated that the rites, ministers, and places of Boodhoo worship shall be maintained and protected, and that for this purpose commissions have been issued from time to time, under the Governor's hand and seal, nominating Boodhist priests to vacant

temple appointments, in order to enable them to maintain their rights to lands belonging to the temples. The Governor has intimated his intention not to sign any more memorials until he has heard from the Secretary of State, and has also recommended that the Delacla relic, a supposed tooth of Buddha, which has been in the hands of the Government since the rebellion in 1848, shall again be given up to the Kandians.

A fresh "Hatti-humayun," or imperial decree, has been published concerning the places in dispute between "those two religious sects," the Greeks and the Latins, viz. the great cupola of the church of the Resurrection; the little cupola in the interior of that church, covering the sepulchre of Jesus Christ; the descent from the cross, the Golgotha, in the interior of the same church; the arcades of the Virgin; the church of Bethlem, the cave where Jesus Christ was born; and the birth-place and tomb of the Virgin. In reference to the church of the Ascension, the decree says:—"Since hitherto the Latins have exercised their religious services there once a year, that is to say, on the day of the Ascension of Jesus Christ, and that the Greeks exercise their religious ceremonies outside the church, and that in the same place a Turkish mosque exists, the church in question does not belong particularly and exclusively to any of the Christian rites above mentioned. But considering in my royal justice that it is not proper that the Greeks, being subjects of my puissant empire, should not be able to exercise their religious worship in the church itself, it has been decided that hereafter the Greeks, the same as the Latins, are not to find any obstacles in praying and performing their religious ceremonies in the interior of that church during the religious days mentioned, on the condition that the present order and state of things be not in any way changed, and that the door of the church be kept, as hitherto, by a Mussulman porter."

AFRICA.

The Rev. O. E. Vidal, D.D., Incumbent of Upper Dicker, Horsebridge, Sussex, has been consecrated in Lambeth Palace Chapel as Bishop of Sierra Leone. The Archbishop of Canterbury was assisted on the occasion by the Bishops of London, Chichester, Oxford, and Cape Town.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.—We quote from the "African Churchman's Magazine" the report of an interesting synodical meeting of the clergy of the diocese of Cape Town, held at Bishop's Court on the 11th of November last and two following days:—

"Clergy of the diocese present—the Bishop. Presbyters—the Ven. the Archdeacon of Graham's Town, the Ven. the Archdeacon of George, the Rev. W. A. Newman, Cape Town; the Rev. R. G. Lamb, ditto; the Rev. and Hon. H. Douglas, ditto; the Rev. M. A. Camilleri, ditto; the Rev. J. Quinn, ditto; the Rev. E. Judge, Simon's

Town; the Rev. J. Fry, Rondeboch; the Rev. H. M. White, Diocesan Collegiate School; the Rev. T. A. Blair, Wynberg; the Rev. H. Badnall, Claremont; the Rev. F. Carlyon, Stellenbosch; the Rev. J. Martine, Worcester. Deacons—Rev. J. W. Van Rees Hoets, Mowbray; Rev. H. Herbert, Diocesan Collegiate School. Secretaries—Rev. H. Badnall, Hon. and Rev. H. Douglas.

“The business of the Synod was proposed by the bishop, and discussed in the following order; the bishop first intimating that he should regard the opinion of each individual clergyman as given confidentially, in order that the discussion might be perfectly free.

“‘I. Is it the opinion of the clergy that the bishop should, while in England, advise with the Church as to the best means to be adopted for inviting the counsel and co-operation of the laity in the affairs of the Church in this diocese?’

“The clergy (with the exception of two who abstained from voting) replied in the affirmative, in the form of the subjoined resolution:—

“‘It is the opinion of the clergy now assembled, that the circumstances of this diocese render it desirable that the judgment of the laity should be consulted on various matters of general interest to the Church in South Africa; and they respectfully express their hope that the bishop will take counsel with the rulers of the Church in England on the best mode of effecting this object.’

“‘II. Is it the opinion of the clergy that members of the Church convicted in the civil courts of grievous crimes, or being open and notorious evil-livers, should be pronounced suspended from the communion of the Church, and not restored until they have openly declared themselves to have truly repented and amended their former naughty life?’

“The clergy (with the exception of one who abstained from voting) unanimously replied in the affirmative.

“‘III. Have the clergy any suggestions to offer with reference either to the steps to be taken in England, or the plans to be adopted here, for the planting of missions in this diocese?’

“The clergy unanimously expressed their conviction that the heathen, particularly in Natal and British Kaffraria, had a direct claim on the zeal and love of the Church, and that an effort in their behalf could not without sin be postponed longer than the present state of the frontier might render necessary; but they thought that, though the obligation to plant missions in South Africa rested chiefly with the Daughter Church, yet that they were entitled in their present weak state to look to England for assistance. Much interest was expressed on behalf of the Fingoe population, and a desire shown to include them, if possible, in the missionary operations of the Church.

“The zeal and labours of other religious communities were referred to, and much shame felt and expressed that the Church had been so backward in this matter.

“The bishop observed that four of the clergy of the diocese had already volunteered for any missionary work he might call them to;

but that he had been unable to spare them from their present posts. His lordship stated that one chief object of his visit to England was to press the claims of the mission-work in South Africa on the Church at home.

“ ‘IV. In what way can the Church most effectually instruct the unconverted heathen in the different existing parishes of the diocese?’

“ The points most dwelt upon under this head were—1. The special obligation of each English congregation throughout the diocese towards the coloured people in their immediate neighbourhood. 2. The duty of endeavouring to impress upon the minds of the heathen that the clergy were sent to them, and took an interest in them. 3. The duty of each head of a family towards his own dependents. 4. The importance of night and Sunday schools. 5. The benefits of a plan already adopted by one or two of the clergy, of taking some only coloured person into their house, with a view to his more complete instruction in the Christian faith. 6. The advantage of a well-directed lay agency, where it could be maintained, in catechetical work.

“ V. Religious services for converts from heathenism ; and the enrolment and instruction of catechumens.

“ It was agreed that distinct services, adapted to the condition of new converts, would soon be wanted ; but that it seemed questionable whether a solitary diocese within the province of Canterbury was at liberty to frame any new public services without consultation with the Church at home ; and that the fact of no other colonial diocese, so far as was known, having yet framed such services, confirmed this view. The bishop said that he would bear this need in mind in his consultations with the rulers of the Church in England.

“ With respect to catechumens, the bishop proposed, and it was unanimously agreed, that any of the heathen within the various parishes who seemed willing to submit to a steady course of preparation for holy baptism should be formally enrolled as catechumens, subscribing their name or mark to the following declaration :—

“ ‘I desire to be enrolled in the class of catechumens, and to be admitted as a candidate for holy baptism in the Church of England.’

“ It was further resolved—

“ That each parish be furnished with a book, headed with the above declaration, in which the names of catechumens shall be enrolled.

“ That the enrolment take place ordinarily in the presence of the clergyman of the parish.

“ That the catechumen sign the above declaration, or, if he be unable to write, the clergyman sign for him, the catechumen affixing his mark.

“ VI. Translations into Dutch, especially of small books of elementary religious knowledge, for the instruction of the coloured people.

“ A committee, consisting of the Rev. W. A. Newman, the Hon. and Rev. H. Douglas, the Revs. M. A. Camilleri and J. W. Van Rees Hoets, having been previously appointed to choose and recommend to the bishop suitable books of the kind above-named, his lordship under-

took to solicit the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to have them translated at the expense of the Society.

“ VII. Division of the diocese into parishes.

“ The bishop announced that he had some time since asked the clergy for information upon which he had hoped he might be able to assign distinctly the boundaries of their several cures ; but that the war having prevented the clergy on the frontier from making those returns, he was obliged to postpone the further consideration of the matter till he came back from England.

“ VIII. Constitution of a dean and chapter.

“ The bishop announced his intention of constituting a dean and chapter to be entitled the ‘ dean and chapter of Cape Town,’ chiefly with the view of having always at hand a recognized body of counselors for all ordinary occasions ; that for the present the chapter would consist of four canons, besides the dean, who would each be required to preach, in whatever might be the cathedral church, twice a year ; that he intended to offer the office of dean to the Rev. W. A. Newman, three of the canonries to the Ven. the Archdeacon of Graham’s Town and George, and the Rev. H. M. White, principal of the diocesan collegiate church, as holding important official positions in the diocese, and the fourth to the Rev. E. Judge, of Simon’s Town, as one of the oldest and the most esteemed of the clergy of the diocese.

“ IX. Regulations for the government of the diocese during absence of the bishop in England.

“ The bishop announced his intentions on this head as follows :—
‘ The archdeacons of the diocese will be appointed special commissaries for their respective archdeaconries.

“ ‘ The rural deans of the Cape, Natal, and St. Helena deaneries will be appointed special commissaries for their respective districts.

“ ‘ The Ven. N. L. Merriman, the Ven. T. E. Welby, the Revs. W. A. Newman, H. M. White, E. Judge, H. Badnall, and the Hon. and Rev. H. Douglas, will be appointed joint commissaries for deciding matters affecting the general interest of the diocese.

“ ‘ The bishop’s domestic chaplain will be the medium through which communications will be addressed to the Government.’

“ As explanatory of the office of special commissary, the following extract from ‘ Burn’s Ecclesiastical Law ’ was read :—

“ ‘ The office of commissary is nearly identical with that of vicar-general. To it belongs the exercise and administration of discipline purely spiritual . . . as visitation, correction of manners, granting institution, and the like, with a general inspection of men and things, in order to the preserving of discipline and good government in the Church.’

“ It was further announced that all matters of a merely temporal character, involving such business as the payment of stipends, of subscriptions to churches and schools, plans and designs for the same, would have to be transacted as hitherto by letters addressed to the Bishop of Cape Town.

"X. Fund for the sick and aged clergy, their widows and orphans.

"It was agreed that such a fund was greatly needed; and that a certain portion of the annual alms of each parish ought to be set aside for this purpose.

"The bishop said that he thought the course suggested in a former pastoral letter, of devoting a fourth part of the collections made for the poor to this object, which had been very successfully followed in several parishes, the best that could be adopted; but where this could not at present be done, the proceeds of the offertories or collections on at least three Sundays in the year, should be devoted to this special purpose, in addition to any subscriptions or donations that might be given. In this proposal the clergy generally concurred.

"It was agreed that the management of the fund thus raised should be at the disposal of a board, to consist of an equal number of clergy and laity.

"The bishop named several clergy as members of the board, and undertook to invite an equal number of laity to co-operate with them.

"A committee was formed for drawing up an outline of rules for the guidance of the board.

"XI. Book of declaration.

"The bishop adverted to the importance of adhering to the rule already laid down by him, and in force, with respect to subscription to the declaration of Church membership on the part of all candidates for confirmation, and all persons claiming a vote in the election of churchwardens in parishes where there is no ordinance.

"XII. War and rebellion.

"The bishop having referred to the present deplorable condition of the colony, the clergy were unanimously of opinion that the continuance of the war, with all its attendant distresses, called for renewed public humiliation before Almighty God; and that it was desirable that the bishop should, previous to communicating with the Government on the subject, confer with the authorities of the Dutch Church, and with such other religious bodies in the colony as he deemed requisite, on the duty of setting apart an early day for that purpose. The anniversary of the breaking out of the war was thought to be the most suitable day.

"XIII. Marriage of catechumens.

"The question was proposed by the bishop—

"'Whether the clergy were of opinion that the marriage service of the Church of England could be rightly solemnized between parties whereof one only was a member of the Church, the other merely a catechumen, under instruction for baptism, but not yet fit for it?'

"The bishop stated that he felt the hardship of refusing marriage in some cases of the kind; but that, being of opinion that the marriage service was intended only for the baptized, he had hitherto made it his rule to refuse.

"The difficulty of the point was acknowledged, and various opinions were expressed; but the clergy generally concurred in the view that the services of the Prayer Book were designed for none but Christians, and

that the difficulty would best be met by a better adaptation of the Church's system to the circumstances of a missionary diocese.

“XIV. Law of divorce.

“The clergy were consulted on the question of the marriage of parties, whereof either should be a divorced person.

“The bishop said that he had doubts and difficulties on this subject, and stated the circumstances of the case as follows:—

“Divorce *a vinculis* is not allowed by the ecclesiastical or temporal law in England. The ecclesiastical courts can only divorce *a mensa et thoro*. No other kind of divorce seems to be recognized by the Church. Occasionally, though rarely, parties are divorced *a vinculis* by special acts of Parliament, and allowed to marry again—the legislature thereby assuming a dispensing power, and relaxing the law in particular cases by special enactment.

“In this colony the supreme court pronounces a divorce *a vinculis*. Every clergyman by his ordination vow pledges himself ‘so to minister . . . the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of God.’

“How ought the clergy to act when persons divorced in the courts of the colony seek to be married again? Are they bound to act in conformity with the expressed view of the Church of England, and decline to marry the parties, or is it a matter in which they may submit to the guidance of the *lex loci*?

“The difficulties in this case are enhanced by the fact that if the first marriage took place in England the divorce here would not be recognized there; and should the parties return to that country, they would be regarded as living in adultery, and the children of such second marriage would be illegitimate.

“After much discussion, the clergy were generally of opinion that the law of the Church seemed so express that it did not appear that a single diocese would be justified in departing from the strict letter of it, and the common practice of the Church, without conference with the other dioceses of the same province. The great difficulty of the subject, however, was freely owned, being increased by the fact that the civil law of this colony gives permission in certain cases to marry after divorce. A wish was expressed by some that the law of the Church could in this respect be relaxed, or some provision made to permit the remarriage of an innocent party, as they supposed that such alteration would involve nothing contrary to the Word of God. Upon this latter point, however, others entertained doubts.

“The bishop informed the clergy that the collections made on the Jubilee day, for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, amounted to 180*l.*, and that they had been transmitted to the Society.

“His lordship laid also before the clergy a tabular statement of the statistics of the diocese, compiled from the returns of the clergy to the questions annually put forth. From the statement it appeared that,

during the year 1850, a sum of upwards of 5000*l.* had been contributed within the diocese for various Church purposes.

“The bishop concluded the proceedings by reading to the clergy a pastoral letter, which he announced his intention of issuing to the diocese, bearing on subjects connected with the object of his intended visit to England.

“Before the blessing was pronounced, the Archdeacon of Graham’s Town, in the name of all the clergy assembled, presented to the bishop the following address :—

“ ‘ *To the Right Reverend Father in God, Robert, Lord Bishop of Cape Town.*

“ ‘ Having been called together by your lordship to express our opinion on several matters of much concern to this diocese, and, in part, connected with the object of your lordship’s intended visit to England, we have felt that it may not be unsuitable to the occasion, and that it will be a source of satisfaction to ourselves, to testify, before we separate, our cordial and grateful sense of your lordship’s consideration in thus taking us into your counsels.

“ ‘ More particularly would we beg to unite in a hearty expression of the deep interest we take in the purposes of your lordship’s temporary return to England, and of our humble and fervent hope that it may please the Great Head of the Church to guide and prosper them all to the glory of his name, and the advancement of his holy religion.

“ ‘ And, withal, we would desire to add the expression of our personal veneration and regard for your lordship, coupled with the assurance that, while absent in the body, you shall not be otherwise regarded than as present with us in the spirit; and that, meanwhile, our prayers shall not be wanting, that it may please Almighty God to pour down upon you the continued dew of his blessing, to preserve, and, in his own good time, to restore you among us.’ ”

At the General Meeting of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, held in London, the Bishop of Oxford in the chair, the Bishop of Cape Town urged the importance of erecting two additional sees in his diocese, one in the east province, the other at Natal, and the establishment of missionary stations in several parts of the country. The Society granted 2000*l.* for the first-named bishopric, and held out a hope of further aid for the see of Natal.

AMERICA.

THE BALTIMORE COUNCIL.—A synodal letter signed by thirty-two archbishops and bishops, including the “Archbishop of Baltimore and Delegate of the Apostolic See,” has been published. Among other topics the epistle refers to the tenure of ecclesiastical property, over which it asserts the absolute control of the episcopate in the most emphatic terms. Preliminary measures are, it is said, adopted for the erection of a new archiepiscopal see at San Francisco. Sees are to be erected at

Santa Fe, Burlington, Portland, Brooklyn, Newark, Erie, Wilmington, Covington, Quincy, and Natches; and apostolic vicariates in Eastern Florida and Michigan.

The question of legalizing Popish endowments is exciting considerable attention in the United States. A bill introduced into the state legislature of New York, providing for the vesting of property in Popish bishops, as corporations sole, and in communities of monks, refusing to take the oath of allegiance, is commented upon in indignant terms. The "Archbishop of New York" has issued a circular to the clergy and laity of his diocese in support of the "Bill for Investing the Catholic Archbishop of New York and his successors, or any other bishop or minister in the state, to hold in trust property which has been created or set apart for religious or charitable uses," in which he pleads the previous recognition of the official character of the Popish bishops, and the passing of similar enactments by the state legislatures of Pennsylvania, Maryland, Illinois, and Kentucky, and denounces certain "pretended Catholics of Buffalo and Rochester" who have protested against the passing of the proposed bill, as "fractions of a faction."

The provincial statute recently passed, which constitutes "the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Quebec" a corporation sole, capable of holding property for ecclesiastical and eleemosynary purposes, has given rise to great dissatisfaction in the provinces of Canada, owing to the rapacity with which the Popish priesthood are exercising their influence over the minds of testators. Two cases more particularly have excited attention; one, that of a priest who, having left a provision for two little boys whom he had adopted, with a reversion to the archiepiscopal corporation, was induced, on his death-bed, to revoke the provision so made, and to bequeath his estate immediately to the archbishop; the other, that of a Mr. Lecourt, architect and civil engineer, who was by similar means despoiled of the inheritance of a rich uncle with whom he lived on terms of the most intimate friendship. In reference to the latter case the following petition has been transmitted to this country, for presentation to Parliament, by the Earl of Roden in the Upper, and by Sir R. H. Inglis in the Lower House:—

"To the Honourable the Knights, Citizens, and Burgesses of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled:

"The petition of J. P. M. Lecourt, of the city of Quebec, in the province of Canada, architect and civil engineer, humbly sheweth:

"That under and in virtue of a provincial Statute passed in the twelfth year of Her Majesty's reign, chapter one hundred and thirty-six, and to which the Royal sanction was given by his Excellency the present Governor-General of British North America, on the thirtieth of May, one thousand eight hundred and forty-nine, the person occupying the position, for the time being, of Roman Catholic Archbishop of Quebec, was incorporated under the name of 'The Roman Catholic Archiepiscopal Corporation of Quebec,' with the right 'to have, hold, purchase, acquire, possess and enjoy' 'any lands, tenements, or heredi-

taments within the province of Canada' 'for the general use or uses eleemosynary, ecclesiastical or educational, of the said Church or religious community, or of any portion of the same community within his district.'

"That the consequence of such incorporation has been, through the means of the confessional—the almost omnipotent control exercised by the Roman clergy over their adherents—and the influence which they can, and do, bring to bear upon persons in their dying moments—the accumulation by the said corporation, represented by one individual only, namely, the archbishop, of enormous wealth and riches from persons induced, and, it may be said, compelled to leave their families and nearest of kin destitute and homeless," &c.

Bishops Delancey, of New York, and M'Coskry, of Michigan, sailed for England, as representatives of the American Episcopal Church at the Jubilee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, at Westminster Abbey.

In the episcopal convention of Pennsylvania, held lately at Philadelphia, a resolution for the admission of *white* delegates representing the Coloured Church of the Crucifixion, was, after a protracted debate, and an eloquent appeal by Bishop Potter in favour of the resolution, negatived. The vote was—Clergy, 39 ayes to 35 nays. Laity, 23 ayes to 27 nays.

Bishop Payne was to sail at the beginning of May for Cape Palmas, with several missionaries. The Bishop of Shanghai has set about making a selection (out of the 40,000 characters which are said to be comprised in the Chinese language) of about four thousand which are most commonly in use or most needed for religious teaching.

The following is a summary of the proceedings of the special diocesan convention of New Jersey, held on the 17th ult. at St. Mary's Church, Burlington:—

"The convention having been duly opened, the bishop read an address, in which, after explaining the reasons for calling the convention, he commented on the interference of the three bishops in the affairs of the diocese of New Jersey. Having thus reiterated his protest, he left the convention to defend their own rights against the uncanonical and intrusive dictation, at the same time declaring that he was ready for the fullest investigation into his conduct, whenever it was properly undertaken. A committee of five presbyters and five laymen was then elected by ballot, on open nominations, which, after an explanatory preamble, reported three resolutions for the adoption of the convention. The first resolution approved the bishop's protest, and declared that, in the judgment of the convention, the action of the three bishops was unwarranted by any canon or custom of the Church. The second expressed unshaken confidence in the bishop, the integrity of his character, and the purity of his intentions throughout his whole episcopate. The third stated the constant willingness of the bishop to meet an investigation, and the willingness of the convention to examine any charges against him if properly laid before them; at the same time

expressing the conviction that such an investigation was wholly unnecessary, either for the benefit of the diocese of New Jersey, or the peace and purity of the Church at large. After an animated discussion, not altogether free from personalities against one of the promoters of the charges against the bishop, the three resolutions were carried by overwhelming majorities by the separate votes of the clergy and laity; after which the convention separated."

The three remonstrant bishops have resolved upon a "presentment" to the House of Bishops against Bishop Doane.

The following are the minutes of the important conference of the Bishops of Quebec, Toronto, Newfoundland, Fredericton, and Montreal, holden at Quebec, from September 24 to October 1, 1851:—

"1. *General Declaration*.—We the undersigned, bishops of the North American colonies in the province of Canterbury, having had opportunity granted to us of meeting together, have thereupon conferred with each other respecting the trust and charge committed to our hands, and certain peculiar difficulties of a local nature which attach to the same. We desire, therefore, in the first place, to record our thankfulness that we have been so permitted to assemble, and our sense of the responsibility lying upon us before God and the world to promote the glory of his great name, to advance the kingdom of his Son, to seek the salvation of immortal souls, and what we feel to be inseparably united with these objects, to establish and extend, wherever there is a demand for her services, the system, the teaching, the worship, and the ordinances of the United Church of England and Ireland. We feel that, in the prosecution of this great work, we are surrounded by many discouragements, embarrassments, and hindrances, which, by the grace of God, we are prepared patiently to encounter, and, while they may be appointed to continue, patiently to endure, but for which, nevertheless, it is our duty to seek all lawful remedy, if such remedy is to be found. We have, therefore, prepared the statement which follows, of our views in relation to these subjects of our care and solicitude; and we desire to commend it to the favourable consideration of our metropolitan, his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, in the hope that he may be moved to assist us in obtaining relief from those evils of which we have to complain, as well as to counsel us in the disposal of questions which come before us in the exercise of our episcopal duties.

"2. *Convocation*.—In consequence of the anomalous state of the Church of England in these colonies with reference to its general government, and the doubts entertained as to the validity of any code of ecclesiastical law, the bishops of these dioceses experience great difficulty in acting in accordance with their episcopal commission and prerogatives, and their decisions are liable to misconstruction, as if emanating from their individual will, and not from the general body of the Church; we, therefore, consider it desirable, in the first place, that the bishops, clergy, and laity of the Church of England in each diocese should meet together in synod, at such times and in such manner as may be agreed. Secondly, that the laity in such synod should meet by

representation, and that their representatives be communicants. Thirdly, it is our opinion that, as questions will arise from time to time which will affect the welfare of the Church in these colonies, it is desirable that the bishops, clergy, and laity should meet in council under a provincial metropolitan, with power to frame such rules and regulations for the better conduct of our ecclesiastical affairs as by the said council may be deemed expedient. Fourthly, that the said council should be divided into two houses, the one consisting of the bishops of these several dioceses under their metropolitan, and the other of the presbyters and lay members of the Church assembled (as before mentioned) by representation. Upon these grounds it appears to us necessary that a metropolitan should be appointed for the North American dioceses.

“ 3. *Church Membership.*—Doubts being entertained who are to be regarded as members of the Church of England in these colonies, and, as such, what are their special duties and rights, we are of opinion that Church membership requires (1) admission into the Christian covenant by holy baptism, as our Lord commanded, ‘in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;’ (2) that all Church members are bound, according to their knowledge and opportunities, to consent and conform to the rules and ordinances of the Church, and (3) according to their ability, and as God hath blessed them, to contribute to the support of the Church; and specially of those who minister to them in holy things. Upon the fulfilment of these duties, they may, as Church members, claim at our hands, and at the hands of our clergy generally, all customary services and ministrations. We cheerfully recognize the duty and privilege of preaching the Gospel to the poor, and of allowing to those who can make us no worldly recompense the same claim upon our services, in public and in private, which we grant to the more wealthy members of our flocks. We are further of opinion that Church members in full communion are those only who receive with their brethren the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, at the hands of their lawful ministers, as directed and enjoined by the canons and rubrics of our Prayer Book. Persons chosen as representatives of any parish or mission to attend any synod or convocation should in every case be members of the Church in full communion.

“ 4. *Canons of 1603-4.*—Although it is confessedly impossible, under existing circumstances, to observe all these canons, yet we are of opinion that they should be complied with so far as is lawful and practicable. But inasmuch as the retention of rules which cannot be obeyed is manifestly inexpedient, and tends to lessen the respect due to all laws, we hold that a revision of the canons is highly desirable, provided it be done by competent authority.

“ 5. *Articles and Formularies.*—Whereas the multiplication of sects, among those who profess and call themselves Christians, appealing to the same Scriptures in support of divers and conflicting doctrines, renders a fixed and uniform standard and interpretation of Scripture more than ever necessary, we desire to express our thankfulness to Almighty God for the preservation of the Book of Common Prayer, our entire and

cordial agreement with the Articles and Formularies of our Church, taken in their literal sense, and our earnest wish (as far as in us lies) faithfully to teach the doctrines and to use the offices of our Church in the manner prescribed in the said book. And we desire that all the members of our Church should accept the teaching of the Prayer Book, as, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, their best help in the understanding of Holy Scripture, and as the groundwork of the religious education of their children.

“ 6. *Division of Services*.—We are of opinion that the bishop, as ordinary, may authorize the division of the morning service, by the use of the morning prayer, litany, or communion service, separately, as may be required; but that no private clergyman has authority, at his own discretion, to abridge or alter the services or offices, or to change the lessons of the Church.

“ 7. *Psalms and Hymns*.—Whereas the multiplication in churches of different hymn books, published without authority, is irregular in itself, and has a tendency to promote division among us, we are of opinion that a judicious selection of psalms and hymns, by competent authority, would tend much to the furtherance of devotion and to the edification of pious Churchmen.

“ 8. *Offertory*.—We are of opinion that it is desirable and seemly, and would tend to a uniformity of practice among us, that whenever a collection is made after sermon, in time of morning prayer, the offertory sentences should be read, and the prayer for the Church militant should be used.

“ 9. *Holy Communion*.—We hold it to be of great importance that the clergy should attend to the directions of the Rubric which precede the administration of the holy communion, respecting ‘open and notorious evil livers, and those who have done wrong to their neighbours by word or deed, and those also betwixt whom they perceive malice and hatred to reign,’ and that the members of the Church should signify to the minister their intention to present themselves at the holy table, especially when they arrive in any place as strangers, or when, being residents in such place, they are purposing to communicate for the first time. We conceive that it would greatly promote the welfare of the Church, if all our members, who may be travelling from one place to another, were furnished with a certificate of their membership and of their standing in the Church.

“ 10. *Marriages*.—We hold that a clergyman knowingly celebrating marriage between persons, who are related to each other within the prohibited degrees set forth in a table of degrees published by our Church in the year of our Lord God, 1563, is acting in violation of the laws of God and of the Church, and is liable to censure and punishment; and that persons who contract such marriages should not be admitted to the holy communion, except upon repentance and putting away their sin. And we recommend that the aforesaid ‘table of prohibited degrees’ should be put up in every church in our dioceses. We are further of opinion that injustice is done our Church in withholding from our bishops the power of granting marriage licences, which is exercised by

the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church ; and that in several dioceses great irregularities, and grievous evils, prevail in consequence of the defective state of the marriage law. We also hold that the clergy of our Church should abstain from celebrating a marriage between persons, both of whom professedly belong to another communion, except in cases where the services of no other minister can be procured.

“ 11. *Registers.*—We would earnestly recommend to the clergy of our dioceses (even though it should not be required by the civil law) to keep accurate registers of marriages, baptisms, and burials, in their several parishes or missions.

“ 12. *Intercommunion with other Reformed Churches.*—We are of opinion that it is much to be desired that there should be no let or hindrance to a full and free communion between ourselves and other reformed episcopal Churches ; and therefore that where we derive our orders from the same source, hold the same doctrines, and are virtually united as members of the same body of Christ, those impediments which (as we are advised) are now in force through the operation of the civil law, ought to be removed.

“ 13. *Education: (a) General.*—Whereas systems of education are very generally introduced and supported in these colonies, either (1) excluding religious instruction altogether from the schools, or (2) recognizing no distinction between Roman Catholics and Protestants ; whereby no opportunity is afforded us of bringing up the children of our communion in the special doctrines and duties of our faith, to the manifest depravation of their religious principles, and with crying injustice to the Church of England ; we desire to express our decided conviction :—

“ (1.) That all education for the members of our Church should be distinctly based on the revealed religion of the Old and New Testaments, with special reference to their duties and privileges as by baptism regenerate, and made God's children by adoption and grace.

“ (2.) That all lawful and honourable methods should be adopted to move the colonial legislatures to make grants to the Church of England as well as to the Roman Catholics, and other religious bodies, as they require it, and according to their numbers respectively, for the education of the members of their own communion.

“ (b) *Sunday Schools.*—(1.) We desire to express our sense of the importance, in the existing state of the Church, of Sunday schools, especially in large towns, and we thankfully acknowledge the benefits which have resulted from the labours of pious teachers both to themselves and to their scholars, under proper direction and superintendence. In every possible case, the Sunday schools should be under the personal direction and superintendence of the minister of the parish or district ; or otherwise the minister should appoint the teachers, choose the books, and regulate the course of instruction ; that there be no contradiction between the teaching of the school and the Church. All Sunday scholars should be instructed in the Church Catechism, and regularly taken to church.

“ (2.) We would carefully guard against the assumption that instruc-

tion in the Sunday school, even by the minister of the parish, may be allowed to supersede the directions of the rubrics and canons, and on the duty of catechising in church; for we distinctly recognize and affirm as well the great importance as the sacred obligation of those directions.

“(c) *Schools for the Higher Classes.*—Schools for the higher classes of both sexes are much required, with particular reference to assisting the clergy in the education of their own children.

“(d) *Collegiate Institutions.*—Although we consider it of great importance that each bishop should connect with his diocese some college or like institution for the special training and preparation of young men for the ministry of the Church, we believe that one university for the North American provinces, with foundations for each diocese, on the model of the two great universities, will be required to complete an educational system, as well for lay students in every department of literature and science, as for the students in theology and candidates for the sacred ministry.

“(e) *Training for the Ministry.*—In addition to the general studies pursued in the college or university, we deem it highly desirable that candidates for the ministry should apply themselves, under competent direction, to a systematic course of reading in theology for at least one whole year, or longer, if possible, previous to their taking holy orders; and that they should likewise be instructed in the duties of the pastoral office, in correct reading and delivering of sermons, in Church music, architecture, &c.

“(f) *Diocesan and Parochial Libraries.*—We deem it very desirable also that libraries should be formed in every diocese under the direction of the clergy, both for the clergy themselves and for their parishioners.

“14. *The Order of Deacons.*—We would wish to discontinue the practice which the necessities of the Church have sometimes forced upon us, of entrusting large independent spheres of duty to young and inexperienced men in deacons' orders, deeming it desirable that every deacon should, if possible, be placed under the direction of an experienced priest.

“15. *Maintenance of the Clergy.*—While we hold it to be the duty of Christian Governments to maintain inviolate whatever endowments have been lawfully and religiously made for the establishment, support, or extension of the Christian religion; and while we acknowledge, with heartfelt gratitude, the aid given to our missions by the venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, to whose fostering care and bounty the Church in these colonies owes, under God, its existence and means of usefulness, we desire to record our conviction that the ordinances of the Church will never be rightly valued, nor its strength fully developed, until the people, for whose benefit the clergy minister in holy things, furnish a more adequate support to the institutions and to the clergy of their Church. Further, as the Society, in consequence of numerous and increasing claims in all parts of the world, is compelled gradually to withdraw its aid, we desire to impress on all our flocks the duty of fulfilling their obligations in

respect of the payment of their ministers; and, with a view to this object, we recommend that the churchwardens in each parish or mission should furnish every year to the bishop a written return, duly certified by themselves and by the clergyman, of the sums paid towards his support for the current year.

“16. *Conclusion.*—Lastly, while we acknowledge it to be the bounden duty of ourselves and our clergy, by God's grace assisting us, in our several stations, to do the work of good evangelists, yet we desire to remember that we have most solemnly pledged ourselves to fulfil this work of our ministry according to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, and as faithful subjects of her most gracious Majesty Queen Victoria, ‘unto whom the chief government of all estates of this realm, whether they be ecclesiastical or civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction.’ And we cannot forbear expressing our unfeigned thankfulness to Almighty God that He has preserved to us, in this branch of Christ's holy Church, the assurance of an apostolic commission for our ministerial calling; and, together with it, a confession of pure and catholic truth, and the fulness of sacramental grace. May He graciously be pleased to direct and guide us all in the use of these precious gifts, enable us to serve Him in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life, and finally bring us to his heavenly kingdom, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

(Signed)

“ G. J. QUEBEC.

“ JOHN TORONTO.

“ EDWARD NEWFOUNDLAND.

“ JOHN FREDERICTON.

“ F. MONTREAL.”

NEWFOUNDLAND.—The bishop has refused to countenance a proposed Seamen's Bethel Ship to be officiated in by ministers of all denominations in turns, and has explained the ground of his objection in a pastoral letter. The House of Assembly has by a majority of one vote recognized the principle of subdividing the Protestant education grant, in all cases where the sum total granted to Episcopalians and Wesleyans exceeds 30%.

BERMUDA.—A public meeting has been held in England, under the auspices of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in furtherance of the efforts now being made to revive the College in Bermuda, for which the famous Bishop Berkeley, at that time Dean of Derry, obtained a charter in the beginning of the last century, and which had for its special object the education of the coloured races of the West Indies. Explanations on the subject were given by the Rev. W. C. Dowding, whom a residence in Bermuda has induced to take up the subject.

It appears from the Newfoundland papers that there is a prospect of justice being conceded to the Church of England in this colony, where the bishop and clergy have long been petitioning, in vain, to have a portion of the grant made annually for Protestant education put into the hands

of the proper authorities of their Church, and spent upon schools managed under their own authorities, instead of the money being made over, in one sum, under the item of grant for "Protestant education," so called and placed under the management and control of boards composed of all denominations; under which system it is clear that the members of the Church have every thing to give up, every thing to lose, and nothing to gain. The "Pilot" of March 13th says:—"After the disposal of sundry matters of minor importance, yesterday, the House of Assembly resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the Education Bill. And after an animated debate on that question, Mr. Hoyles, the introducer of the measure, having, on the suggestion of Mr. Winser, consented to limit the application of the principle of the bill to cases where the total sum for the schools of Episcopalians and Wesleyans shall exceed 30*l.*, the principle of sub-division of the Protestant education grant was then carried, in committee, by a majority of one vote.

AUSTRALIA.

NEW ZEALAND.—The Bishop of New Zealand held a Visitation at Lyttelton on the last Friday in November, when he appointed two clergymen, elected by the clergy, his temporary commissaries, until the erection of the settlement into a separate see, and made other provisional arrangements for the benefit of the future diocese. His lordship on that occasion stated, that after conferring with the Governor-in-Chief, he had recommended the division of the islands into three dioceses, one of Auckland and the northern portion, another of Wellington and the central portion, and a third of Lyttelton, extending southwards from the forty-third parallel.

The bishopric of Christ Church, New Zealand, has been conferred upon the Rev. J. P. Gell, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, and formerly Warden of Christ Church College, Tasmania.

ADELAIDE.—The committee of the South Australian Church Society has published a report, containing a plan of Church Organization, drawn up in answer to a call made upon the Society by the bishop in consequence of all aid from the State towards the support of the Church having been withdrawn by the provincial legislature. The following is a brief outline of the proposed "constitution for the Church in the diocese, to consist of the bishop, synod of clergy, and convention of laity; together forming a general diocesan assembly:—"—

"The appointment of bishops to remain in the Crown. The synod of clergy to consist of all licensed officiating ministers, presbyters alone to vote. The convention of laity to consist of lay delegates, being communicants, from all the congregations in the diocese, to be elected by the seat-renters. The convention and synod presided over by the bishop, to constitute the diocesan assembly. No rule to be binding on the members of the Church without the concurrent assent of the

bishop, synod, and convention, in the diocesan assembly. The synod and convention to deliberate apart, or by mutual agreement in conference with each other, or with the bishop. The assent or dissent of the synod and convention, to be determined by a majority of votes in each order, openly or by ballot. The diocesan assembly to meet annually in January. The bishop to report in writing on the general state of the diocese, the clergy on the state of their parishes. Extraordinary meetings of the assembly to be convened by the bishop, or upon the requisition of seven clergymen of five years' standing in priests' orders, or of ten delegates. No alteration to be made in the Thirty-nine Articles, the three Articles of the 36th Canon, the rule of interpretation laid down in the declaration prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles, the Book of Common Prayer, or the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures. In the exercise of discipline over the clergy the bishop to be assisted by five clergymen in priests' orders, two of whom to be the dean of the Cathedral Church and the archdeacon, and the other three nominated by the bishop from the synod at the annual meeting of the diocesan assembly, forming together a court of first instance, to be called the consistorial court. Offences requiring a heavier punishment than censure to be inquired into in a court of delegates, consisting of five clerical and five lay members, to be annually appointed by ballot by the diocesan assembly. The bishop, his chancellor, or other deputy to act as president, and to decide in case of equality of votes. To give effect to the judgment of the court of delegates a clause to be inserted in every trust deed, for determining the tenure of any minister by means of the sentence of the court of delegates. An appeal to be allowed from the sentence of the consistorial court to the bishop in synod, or to the superior ecclesiastical courts, and from the sentence of the court of delegates to the diocesan assembly. Provision is also made for the appointment of church committeemen, vestries, sidesmen, for the exercise of patronage, the management of parishes, and the keeping of registers. The financial affairs of the Church are proposed to be carried on by means of three distinct funds, a 'Pastoral Aid Fund,' 'An Endowment Fund,' and an 'Educational Fund,' under the control of the diocesan assembly. The Pastoral Aid Fund to be established by means of subscriptions of 3s. per quarter from every adult member of the Church willing to subscribe, and of annual sermons to be preached in all the churches, and to be dispensed in aid to ministers whose income from pew-rents and surplice fees may not reach the minimum of 150*l.* per annum; and for the support of itinerant missionaries. The two other funds, raised by subscriptions and donations, to be applied respectively to the building of churches and parsonage-houses, and the purchase of glebe lands, and to the building of schools and increase of teachers' salaries."

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, NOTICES, AND INTELLIGENCE.

Afflictions do not absolutely and essentially incline man to repent and be renewed, 280.

Artillery, deficiency of, complained of by the Duke of Wellington in 1815, 166.

Athanasius, St., description of, in Pigott's "Patriarch of the Nile," 467.

Barry Cornwall, his lyric, "Within and Without," 424.

Bentinck, Lord George, Lines from the Elegy on, by the Rev. C. F. Watkins, 450.

Blandford, Marquis of, his Bill on Episcopal and Capitular Revenues, 391; all legislation on this subject objected to by some, 392; union of the office of dean and bishop, 393; premature in the present state of things, 394; deaneries not necessarily sinecures, 395; the bishop-dean's residence, 396; cathedral schools, 397; canonries not to be united with cures of souls, 398; contradicted by clause xiii., 399; limitation of the number of canons residentiary, 400; the propriety of this doubtful, 401; amendments proposed, 402; tribunal of canons for the trial of clergy, 403, 404; restoration of the sees of Westminster, Gloucester and Bristol, and the erection of new sees, 405; the constitution of chapters, 406; chapter property, 407; augmentation of the incomes of canons, 408; the management of bishops' estates to be transferred to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, 409, 410; Lord Blandford's Bill placed in the hands of government, 411; Mr. Secretary Walpole's speech on it, 412; an increase in the episcopate called for, 413; summary of suggestions in reference to Lord Blandford's Bill, 414, 415.

Christian Sabbath, the, Mr. Montgomery's lines on, 229.

Church of Rome, the, is the Babylon of the book of Revelation, 223.

Corn Colonies, 315; the wretched dwellings of the poor one great cause of their social degradation, 316; little done to ameliorate this by the Whigs, 317; we hope much from the Derby administration, 318; statistics of the dwellings of the working classes, 319; their crowded state the fruitful source of immorality and crime, 320; Mr. Sadler's plan for ameliorating this, 321; Mr. Atherley's proposal of establishing Corn Colonies, 322, 323; beneficial objects on which to expend their proceeds, 324; asylums to be erected for the aged and infirm poor, 325; this scheme strongly recommended, 326.

Cyril, St., his example in times of schism and division in the Church, 461.

Dublin, Archbishop of, his reply to some objections against the assembling of a synod, 446—448.

Eastern Christianity, Russia and France exercise great influence over its fortunes, 443.

Eclipse of Faith, the; or, a Visit to a Religious Sceptic, 273; scheme of the work, 274; probably the writing of Mr. Isaac Taylor, 275; modern infidelity a bastard deism, 276; calling themselves, but rejecting all the peculiar doctrines of Christianity, 277; the extravagance and absurdity of these transcendentalists, 278; the jests of Hetherington and Holioake more calculated to mislead the working classes, 279; parallel between John Henry

and Francis William Newman, 280; the sceptic Harrington described, 281; the leading positions of the spiritualists refuted, 282; the question of miracles, 283; the "Blank Bible," 284—287; the acute reasoning, eloquence, and humour, of the book, 288.

Gladstone, Mr., the "Church, Press, and Religious Liberty," 337; the imputation of *inconsistency* where justly applied, 338; entire change of Mr. Gladstone's views, 339; exposed in the following page, 340; as also of the "Morning Chronicle," 341; Mr. Gladstone's former views on the relation of Church and State, 342; his entire change of opinions defended by the "Morning Chronicle," 343; as well as by the "Guardian," 344; yet denied by the latter on the following week, 345; which further suppresses the truth, 346; Mr. Gladstone's former views of religious indifference of the State, 347; contrasted with new theories of "religious liberty," 348; also of scriptural prophecies of the triumphs of the Church, 349; he would have religious ceremonies vary in some degree with different congregations, 350; and discourages the systematic practice of "auricular confession," 351; he renounces the duty of religious profession in the State, 352; without assigning a reason, as shown by Mr. Wordsworth, 353; the Hampden and Gorham judgments, insufficient reasons, 354; the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill," 355; Mr. Gladstone's theory of "religious liberty," 356; yet the religious character of the State not "less definite" than in 1847, 357; but more so, 358; former fatal results of "religious freedom," 359; Mr. Gladstone's fallacious plea for its support, 360; the authority of Scripture not to be tampered with, 361; retrogression of the "Church party" in the esteem of the great body of the people, 362; the ruinous mischief of the course of Mr. Gladstone, D. C. L., and their party, 363; dangerous nature of their principles, 364; which would divest the Sovereign of a personal conscience, 365; and allow prayer to be offered by ministers of any persuasion in parliament, 366, 367; the "Guardian's" misrepresentation of Mr. Wordsworth's Letter, 368; and defence of Mr. Gladstone by a misera-

ble evasion, 369, 370; the object of this article, 371; warnings to Churchmen, 372; Mr. Gladstone's Letter to Mr. Greswell, 373; its bearing on the article, 374; irreconcilable with the statements of the "Guardian" and "Morning Chronicle," 375; should he not deny these statements, 376; can Churchmen be satisfied with his declared desire for the maintenance of existing relations of Church and State, 377, 378.

Gurney, Mr. Archer, his poems, 104; remarks on the various epochs of talents in the history of the world, 105; that of the French Revolution, 106; Montgomery and Keble, 107; Tennyson, 108; Archer Gurney's translation of Faust, 109; he explains the plan and object of the poem, 110—112; the opening scene, 113; song of the drunken man, 114; "Adhemar's Vow," 115; the "Young Nun's Dream," 116—119; the "Martyrs," 120; on "Daily Praise and Prayer," 121; on "Roman Catholic Wanderers from the Church's Fold," 122, 123; remarks on the principles of criticism of poets, 124, 125; of dramatists, 126—128; Archer Gurney entitled to the title of dramatist, 129; his drama of Charles I., 130; extract showing the demand for Strafford's death, 131—133; Queen Henrietta's persuasions thereto, 134; palliations of Charles' desertion of Strafford, 135; the battle of Naseby, 136, 137; Cromwell's tent, 138, 140; the character of Cromwell, 141.

James, G. P. R., extracts from his "Old Oak Chest," on past deeds; and faith, hope, and charity, 422.

Juvenile Offenders, 241; special difficulties in dealing with them, 242; from his ignorance of the evils of the ways of sin, 243; common modes of dealing with them, 244; insufficient punishment, 245; which does not deter them from crime, 246; one of the great causes of which is evil example, 247; separation from evil associates therefore necessary, 248; as well as training and teaching in a reformatory school, 249, 250; two objections to this mode, 251; both answered, 252; our present reformatory schools, 253; voluntary asylums not sufficient, 254; a subject for the most serious consideration of our legislators, 255, 256.

Lethe, a poem by Miss Woodrooffe, extract from, 431.

Litton, Rev. E. A., his work on the Church of Christ, 289; a subject open to inquiry and discussion, 290; tenets held in common but with different degrees of *prominence* in various systems, 291; plan of Mr. Litton's work, 292; he refrains from referring to Scripture as the exponent of systems of belief, 293; or to the Creeds, 294; and limits himself to the Tridentine definition, and the Protestant confession, 295; the doctrine conveyed in the latter, 296; not correctly represented, 297, 298; Scripture speaks of the Church Universal and particular Churches, 299; the Christian ministry a feature in the Divine economy, 300, 301; the Church has an outward, also an invisible capacity, 302; here was a system worked from *within* outwardly, 303; the "notes" of the Church, 304; the origin and authority of Episcopacy, 305, 306; from the Primitive Church, as well as from Scripture, 307, 308; moderation with which the Reformation treated the Papacy, 309; Mr. Litton's views on ordination, 310; and on infant baptism, 311, 312; admitted to be scriptural, should be acknowledged as the outward sign of regeneration, 313; the value of Mr. Litton's work, 314.

Longfellow, criticism on his poetry, 435; his *Golden Legend*, 436; its poor subject and treatment, 437; the introduction, 438; a wretched rifacimento of *Faust*, 439; offensive fictions and prayers, 440; a miracle play, 441; concluding criticisms, 442.

Lovely Home, lines on a, by Miss Woodrooffe, 432.

Marlborough, The Life of John, Duke of, by Archibald Alison, 1; his peculiarities and repetitions as an author, 2; his ignorance of Church principles, 3; and consequent mistakes, 4; his confusion of love and illicit passion, 5; Marlborough stained with profligacy and a traitor to his benefactor, 6; yet an object for admiration and esteem, 7; his contemporaries, Louis XIV., 8, 9; essentially monarchical, 10, 11; and James II., 12, 13; William III., 14; Queen Anne, 15, 16; Marlborough employed on diplomatic missions, 17; conducts the Grand Alliance against France, 18; appointed Commander-in-Chief, 19; gloomy prospects of 1704,

20, 21; friendship of Marlborough and Prince Eugene, 22; the battle of Blenheim, 23, 24; midnight communion on its eve, 25; the first attack, 26; passage across the Nebel, 27; Lutzingen carried, 28; the battle gained, 29; honours showered upon Marlborough, 30; causes of his decline in the queen's favour, 31, 32; Louis XIV. offers terms to the allies, 33; Marshal Villars takes the field, 34; the siege of Tournay and Mons, 35; battle of Malplaquet, 36, 37.

Martineau, Miss, her "mesmeric Atheism," 279.

Mexico, Life in, by Mr. Mason, 212; enormous wealth of the Mexican Church, 213; curious history of hiding the treasures of a Church in troublous times, 213—215; story of the escape of an *arriero* from Céperos, 216—219; adventure of a wild-cattle hunter of the prairie, 220—222.

Modern Latin Versification, 38, 39; methods of acquiring it, 40; translations substituted for original composition, 41; those of Mr. Drury, Mr. Linwood, and Dr. Kennedy, 42; the Rev. Mr. Hodgson's "Mythology for Versification," 43, 44; his "Sacred Lyrics," 45; one on Isaiah liii. l. 46; and on Job xix., 47; admirable object of the book, 48.

Moodie's Life in Canada, 379; toil and hardships of a gentleman settler, 380; a "comfortable house," 381; neighbours, 382; apt at borrowing, 383, 384; the Irish "help," 385; the washing of his shirt, 386; the fallows on fire, 387, 388; anecdotes of bears, 389, 390.

Montgomery, Robert, extract from his poems on Jehovah, 418; lines on Christian Love, 419; a Father's Grief, 420; Reverence due to the Sabbath, 421.

Napier, Sir Charles, his defence of the "Queen of Weapons," 164.

National Defences should be maintained in time of peace, 142, 143; prospects of war, 144; Col. Chesney's "Observations on Fire-arms," 145; shows the inefficient state of the British artillery, 146; historical sketch of artillery, 147; in China and India, 148, 149; in Europe, 150; comparative strength of Continental and British artillery, 151; inadequate defence of England and the colonies, 152; danger of foreign invasion, 153; an increase of

artillery absolutely necessary, 154; slowness of promotion, 155, 156; the remedy proposed for this evil, 157; relative merits of horse and field artillery, 158; should be separated to make each efficient, 159; pontoons, 160; promotion by *merit*, 161; necessity for this shown in the case of Sir Alexander Dickson, 162; reduction of existing number of ranks, 163; new muskets, 164; change in the artillery armament proposed, 165; deficiency of artillery complained of by the Duke of Wellington, 166; the Master-general of the Ordnance should be merged in the Commander-in-Chief, 167; concluding remarks on Col. Chesney's book, 168.

Newman, Dr., his writings, 49; personal remarks, 50; the changed *style* of his sermons, 51; on the "Immaculate Conception," 52, 53; his Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England, 54; his attempted defence of the Jesuits, 55; contrary to the views of Fleury, 56; he revives the old slander of the Church of England about Henry VIII., 57; unlike his co-religionist Mr. Pugin, 58; and contrary to history in the case of James II., 59; his artful mingling of cause with effect in the preaching of Protestantism, 60, 61; his venom against the English Church, 62, 63; "Rate-books of the Papal Penitentiary," 64; from the writings of Claude D'Espence, 65; the vow of celibacy encourages sin, 66, 67; Archdeacon Stopford's reply to Mr. Marshall's praise of St. John's virginity, 68; image worship upheld by Protestant dishonouring of images, 69, 70; "Protestant persecution," 71; intercourse with "perverts," 72; "Protestant intolerance," 73; Dr. Achilli, 74; persecution defended, 75; the "mildness and mercy" of the Romish See, 76, 77; no analogy with any Protestant persecutions, 78; Romish priests executed in the reign of James I. as traitors, 79; shown by a quotation from the Rev. C. O'Connor's *Columbanus*, 80; Romish miracles, 81; belief in them and the Incarnation maintained on the same ground, 82, 83; but not truly on the same level of "antecedent probability," 84; the liquefaction of St. Januarius' blood, 85; Newman's argument leads to infidelity, 86; as shown by a blasphemous extract from the "Weekly Dispatch,"

87, 88; probably written by a Romanist, 89; Papal Aggression, 90; a deliberate breach of good faith, 91; the case of Lord Feilding and Miss Talbot, 92; the case of "*Metairie versus Wiseman*," 93, 94; with reference to Carré, 95; to Mr. Coke, 96; and to Mr. Holdstock, 97; fully approved by Cardinal Wiseman, 98; the case of Mr. J. M. Taylor, 99, 100; that of Mr. Alexander M'Carthy, 101; Mr. Newman challenged to produce any such acts sanctioned by the English Church, 102, 103.

Newman, John Henry, a parallel drawn between him and Francis William, his brother, 280.

O'Connor, Rev. C., an extract from his "*Columbanus*," showing that the Romish priests were executed in the reign of James I. as traitors, 80.

Palmerston, Lord, his remarks on the danger of foreign invasion, 153.

Parochial Tales, extract from, on moral and physical cowardice, 416, 417.

Pasley, Major-General Sir Charles, his Letters on the Pontoon Service in the "Morning Chronicle," 159.

Peile, Rev. Dr., his Annotations on the Apostolical Epistle, 327; previous Commentaries on the Bible, 328; sources from which these Annotations have been drawn, 329, 330; remarks on 1 Cor. vii. 10. 12. 14, 331; not sufficient prominence given to the argument for Infant Baptism, 332; comments on 1 Cor. vii. 36, 37, 333; and on Gal. iii. 19, 20, 334—336; the value of Dr. Peile's Commentary, 337.

Price, Mr. Bonamy, on the Anglo-Catholic Theory, 169; statements of existing dangers to the Church, 170; of which convocation is the remedy, 171; discouragement to the Anglo-Catholic party in the secession of their leaders, 172, 173; Mr. Price's description of "Anglo-Catholicism," 174; which, he thinks, the system also of Romanism with the logical addition of infallibility, 175; by which he settles the obligation of Episcopacy, 176; Romanists practically driven to exercise "private judgment," 177; Mr. Bonamy Price, and such writers, play into the hands of Romanists, 178; his unjust remarks on the Anglo-Catholic theory, 179; and various inaccurate statements, 180; his ideas of "Protestantism," 181; and

rejects "Ultra-Protestantism" in a certain sense, 182; his theory similar to that of Dr. Arnold, 183; such principles afford no safeguard against Romanism, 184; Mr. Price holds *some* kind of obligation to adhere to the Church, 185; the consistency and method of an English Churchman's faith, 186, 187; Mr. Price ascribes secessions to Rome to the Anglo-Catholic theory, 188; but he misrepresents "Church principles," 189, 190; and excludes theology as a cause of defection, 191; an unjust and limited view, 192; the true safeguards against Rome, 193, 194; the Church of England Catholic and Apostolic, 195, 196; her *authority*, 197.

Reforms called for in the Church, according to Dr. Heischer, 427.

Sibyl, the, by Domenichino, Lines on, by Miss Woodrooffe, 433.

Smith, the Rev. Theyre T., Sketch of his Life, 445; extract from his Sermon "On the Design of our Saviour in the Use of Parables," 445, 446.

Songs of the Bells, the, by the Rev. James Dixon, extract from, 462.

Stopford, Archdeacon, his reply to Dr. Marshall's reason for leaving the Church of England, that she had no "holy virginity," 68; his observations on the "mildness and mercy" of the Romish See, 76.

Tales of Kirkbeck, edited by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, 257; able description of the good doctor, 258, 259; St. Patrick's Chapel, 260, 261; "Puir Steevan," 262; his sad story, 263, 264; recent events connected with the editor of this book, 265; practical infallibility too often assumed, 266; dangers resulting from this, 267; Mr. Bennett's resignation of St. Barnabas, 268; his appointment to Frome Selwood, 269; the House of Mercy at Plymouth, 270; England the great stronghold of Christianity against papal error, 271, 272.

Temporary Churches much needed now, 226.

Thiers, M., dissuades Louis Napoleon from a hostile descent on our coasts, 144.

Virgin, the Blessed, her modesty and humility not the cause but the consequence of her election to be the Mother of our Lord, 423.

Warburton, Eliot, his character, 198; Tennyson's Lines on Arthur Hallam applied to him, 199; his "Crescent and the Cross," 200; and "Reginald Hastings," 201; description of the battle of Edgehill, 202—206; portraiture of Cromwell, 207; easy, grave, and calm truthfulness of the book, 208.

END OF VOL. XVII.



THE
ENGLISH REVIEW.

VOL. XVIII.
OCTOBER—JANUARY.

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

1853.

LONDON :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

INDEX

OF

BOOKS REVIEWED.

. For remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Notices, and Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

Adams—The Elements of Christian Science. A Treatise upon Moral Philosophy and Practice. By William Adams, S.T.P., 207.

Africa laid open, Inner; in an attempt to trace the chief Lines of Communication across that Continent, south of the Equator. By William Desborough Cooley, 340.

Alford—The Greek Testament, with a Critically revised Text; a Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a copious Critical and Exegetical Commentary. By Henry Alford, B.D., 441.

Alison—History of Europe from the Fall of Napoleon to the Accession of Louis Napoleon. By Sir Archibald Alison, Bart., 432.

America and the American Church. By the Rev. H. Caswall, M.A., 208.

American Pulpit, the, 464.

Anley—Earlswood; or, Lights and Shadows of the Anglican Church. By Charlotte Anley, 205.

Anticleptic Gradus, the, founded on Quicherat's Thesaurus Poeticus Linguae Latinæ. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, M.A., 198.

Ark and other Sermons, the. By the Rev. Richard Bellis, 208.

Arnold—A Complete Greek and English Lexicon for the Poems of Homer and the Homeridæ, &c. By G. Ch. Crusius. Translated from the German by Henry Smith. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, M.A., 434.

Arnold—A History of Ireland. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, M.A., 200.

Arnold—Eclogæ Aristophanicæ. Part II. From the Birds; with English Notes, &c. By C. C. Felton, M.A. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, M.A., 194.

Arnold—The Anticleptic Gradus; founded on Quicherat's Thesaurus Poeticus Lin-

guæ Latinæ. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, M.A., 198.

Auricular Confession, &c. By William Pearce, Esq., 208.

Baines—Sermon on the Death of the Duke of Wellington. By the Rev. J. Baines, 464.

Bandinel—Milton Davenant; a Tale of the Times we live in. By the Rev. James Bandinel, 317.

Bartholomew—A Charge on Convocation. By Archdeacon Bartholomew, 464.

Bellis—The Ark and other Sermons. By the Rev. Richard Bellis, 208.

Bickersteth—Israel Hartmann, as Youth, Husband, and Orphan Schoolmaster. A Biography from his Diary and Letters. Translated from the German by Mr. Thompson. With a Preface by the Rev. R. Bickersteth, 195.

Binney—Sermon on the Death of the Duke of Wellington. By Mr. T. Binney, 464.

Bonnell, The Life of James, 438.

Brettingham—Devotions from the Psalms. Selected by Clara M. Brettingham, 204.

Browne—Convocation. A Letter to the Right Hon. S. H. Walpole, Secretary of State, &c. By E. Harold Browne, M.A., Preb. of Exeter, 166.

Brydges, A Letter to Sir Brook W. By John Keble, M.A., 116.

Bunsen—Hippolytus and his Age; or, the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus. By Christian Charles Josias Bunsen, D.C.L., 239.

Burton—Falconry in the Valley of the Indus. By Lieut. R. F. Burton, 206.

Butler—Sermons Doctrinal and Practical. By the Rev. W. Archer Butler, M.A. Edited by the Rev. T. Woodward, M.A., 203.

- Caswall—A Pilgrimage to Canterbury in 1852.* By the Rev. H. Caswall, 214.
- Caswall—Synodical Action necessary to the Church.* By the Rev. H. Caswall, 214.
- Caswall—America and the American Church.* By the Rev. H. Caswall, M.A., 208.
- Catholic Layman, The, for August.* VIII., 116.
- Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Creed of the Church of Rome, an Inquiry into.* Part III., *The Sacrifices of the Mass and Transubstantiation.* By Charles Smith, B.D., 212.
- Champney—A Textual Commentary on the Book of Psalms.* By H. M. Champney, 202.
- Charles the Fifth—The Cloister Life of the Emperor.* By William Stirling, 437.
- Chief Truths, the,* 451.
- Children, Sermons to, preached in St. Stephen's Church, Brighton.* By the Rev. George Wagner, M.A., 480.
- Christian Sacrifice of the Eucharist, the.* By George Hay Forbes, 207.
- Christian Science, The Elements of—A Treatise upon Moral Philosophy and Practice.* By William Adams, S.T.P., 207.
- Christian Union; its Necessity, the Grounds on which it may be hoped for, and the Obstacles to its Attainment, &c.—Six Sermons.* By the Rev. J. Paul, B.A., 197.
- Christie—A Letter to the Right Hon. J. W. Henley on Life Assurance Associations.* By R. Christie, Esq., 214.
- Christie—The Rule of the Church a Law to all her Members; or, Faith and Obedience in relation to the Church: a Sermon.* By the Rev. J. Christie, M.A., 439.
- Chronology of the Old Testament, an Attempt to illustrate the, by a reference to the Year of Jubilee.* By the Rev. G. B. Sandford, M.A., 196.
- Church Dictionary, a.* By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, 438.
- Church Difficulties of the Present Time, Lectures principally on the.* By the Rev. J. M. Ncale, M.A., 195.
- Church of Ireland; Occasional Sermons preached in Westminster.* Fourth Series. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. *On the Church of Ireland,* 206.
- Church in Spain, the Practical Working of the.* By the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A., 56.
- Churchman's Monthly Penny Magazine, the, and Guide to Truth.* September, 1852, 184.
- Church Service, the,* 451.
- Church's Shadow, the,* 214.
- Classical Dictionary of Biography, Mythology, and Geography; a smaller, abridged from the larger Dictionary.* By William Smith, LL.D., 202.
- Clerke—A Charge.* By the Ven. C. Clerke, D.D., 464.
- Codd—Sermons addressed to a Country Congregation; together with those preached before the University of Cambridge in January, 1851.* By the Rev. E. Thornton Codd, M.A., 210.
- Cole—A Reflective Letter to the Agricultural Society.* By the Rev. H. Cole, 214.
- Colloquies of Edward Osborne, the, Citizen and Clothworker of London, as reported by ye Authure of "Mary Powell,"* 433.
- Confession and Absolution; a Letter to to the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, on a Sermon preached by him, &c.* By Henry, Lord Bishop of Exeter, 442.
- Confirmation; or, Tracts for the Use of Persons about to be Confirmed,* 451.
- Convocation; a Letter to the Right Hon. S. H. Walpole, Secretary of State, &c.* By E. Harold Browne, M.A., Prebendary of Exeter, 166.
- Convocation, Hand-Book to.* By Henry J. Rhodes, M.A., 438.
- Convocation of the two Provinces, the, their Origin, Constitution, and Forms of Proceeding; with a Chapter on their Revival.* By George Trevor, M.A., Canon of York, 435.
- Convocation, The Appeal to; A Charge.* By Robert J. Wilberforce, Archdeacon of the East Riding, 166.
- Conybeare—The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M.A., and the Rev. J. L. Howson, M.A., 438.
- Cooley—Inner Africa laid open, in an attempt to trace the chief Lines of Communication across that Continent, South of the Equator.* By William Desborough Cooley, 340.
- Cousin—Course of the History of Modern Philosophy.* By M. Cousin. Translated by Mr. Wright, 464.
- Currey—Sermon on the Death of the Duke of Wellington.* By the Rev. G. Currey, 464.

Cyclopædia Bibliographica, the, 214.

Daily Service—Letter of Advice to all Members of the Church of England, 214.

Death of the Duke of Wellington—Ode on the. By Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate, 425.

Death—The Christian's Hope in : a Series of Sermons on the Burial Service of the Church of England. By J. Endell Tyler, B.D., 38.

De Teissier—A Companion to the Lord's Supper. By the Rev. G. F. De Teissier, M.A., 211.

Diocesan Synods and Convocation. A Charge by the Rev. J. Garbet, Archdeacon of Chichester, 166.

Diocesan Synods in England—The Ancient Practice, and Proposed Revival of, in England. By William Pound, M.A., 166.

Dowden—Walks after Wild Flowers ; or, the Botany of the Bohereens. By Richard Dowden (Richard), 206.

Earlswood ; or, Lights and Shadows of the Anglican Church. By Charlotte Anley, 205.

Ecclesiastical Synods—Some Objections to the Revival of, answered. A Sermon by the Rev. J. D. Wheeler, M.A., 166.

Eclogæ Aristophanicæ, Part II. From "The Birds," with English Notes, &c. By C. C. Felton, A.M. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, M.A., 124.

England, Ireland, and Exeter ? By a Cambridge Monk, 214.

English Alice ; a Poem in Nine Cantos. By A. J. Evelyn, Esq., 196.

Epistles and Gospels of the Christian Year—A short Explanation of the ; with Questions for the Use of Schools, 434.

Evans—Christianity in its Homely Aspect ; or, Discourses on Various Subjects, delivered in the Church of St. Andrew, Wells-street. By the Rev. Alfred Bowen Evans, 201.

Evelyn—English Alice ; a Poem in Nine Cantos. By Alexander John Evelyn, Esq., 196.

Exeter—The Lord Bishop of. A Letter to the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter on Confession and Absolution. By Henry Lord Bishop of Exeter, 442.

Eyre—The Fall of Man ; from Milton's "Paradise Lost." By the Rev. Charles Eyre, A.B., 435.

Fairbairn—The Revelation of St. John ;

expounded for those who search the Scriptures. By E. W. Hengstenberg, Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, 203.

Fairton Village ; or, Wesleyan Beginnings, 213.

Falconry in the Valley of the Indus. By Lieutenant Richard F. Bristow, 206.

Forbes—A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed, for the use of Persons beginning the Study of Theology. By A. P. Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin, 200.

Forbes—The Christian Sacrifice of the Eucharist, &c. By George Hay Forbes, 207.

Franchi—The Philosophy of the Italian Schools. Letter to Professor G. M. Bertini. By Ausonio Franchi, 454.

Future Human Kingdom of Christ ; or, Man's Heaven to be this Earth, &c. By the Rev. D. J. Heath, M.A., 209.

Fourdrinier—Our New Parish ; its Privileges and Progress. By Harriet E. Fourdrinier, 209.

Garbett—Diocesan Synods and Convocation. A Charge by the Rev. J. Garbett, Archdeacon of Chichester, 166.

Gilbert's Clergyman's Almanack, and Churchman's Miscellany for 1853, 433.

Goodwin—The Worthy Communicant. By the Rev. H. Goodwin, 464.

Gospel Missionary, the ; for 1852, 463.

Grant—History of Physical Astronomy, from the Earliest Ages to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century. By Robert Grant, F.R.A.S., 210.

Greece—A First History of Greece. By the Author of "Amy Herbert," 450.

Greek Testament, the ; with a Critically Revised Text ; a Digest of various Readings ; Marginal References to verbal and idiomatic Usages ; Prolegomena, and a copious Critical and Exegetical Commentary. By Henry Alford, B.D., 441.

Green—Lives of the Princesses of England from the Norman Conquest. By Mary Anne Everett Green, 206.

Gresley—Sermon on Church Music. By W. Gresley, Prebendary of Lichfield, 464.

Griffin—Sermons on the Creed of Pope Pius IV. By the Rev. J. N. Griffin, A.B., 213.

"Guardian" of July 7th, the ; "The English Review," and Mr. Gladstone, 116.

- Hale**—*Cost an Element of Sacrifice. A Sermon by the Rev. Philip Hale, B.A.*, 213.
- Hamilton**—*The Pentateuch and its Assailants. A Refutation of the Objections of Modern Scepticism to the Pentateuch.* By William T. Hamilton, D.D., 434.
- Head**—*A Fortnight in Ireland.* By Sir Francis B. Head, 369.
- Heath**—*The Future Human Kingdom of Christ; or, Man's Heaven to be this Earth, &c.* By the Rev. D. J. Heath, M.A., 209.
- Hengstenberg**—*The Revelation of St. John; expounded for those who search the Scriptures.* By E. W. Hengstenberg, Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by the Rev. Patrick Fairbairn, 203.
- Hero's Funeral, the; a Poem.** By Robert Montgomery, M.A., 430.
- Heurtley**—*Parochial Sermons preached in a Village Church. Third Series.* By the Rev. C. A. Heurtley, B.D., 435.
- Hippolytus and his Age; or, the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus.** By Christian Charles Josias Bunsen, D.C.L., 239.
- History of Europe, from the Fall of Napoleon to the Accession of Louis Napoleon.** By Sir Archibald Alison, Bart., 432.
- Holy Baptism; selected from the Tracts for Parochial use,** 451.
- Holy Stone,** 214.
- Hook**—*A Church Dictionary.* By Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, 438.
- Howarth**—*Sermon on the Death of the Duke of Wellington.* By the Rev. H. Howarth, 464.
- Howson**—*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M.A., and the Rev. J. L. Howson, M.A., 438.
- Huntingford**—*Thoughts on some portions of the Revelations of St. John the Divine.* By the Rev. Edward Huntingford, B.C.L., 208.
- Infirm, Sick, and Dying Members of the Church of England, a Guide for.** By Henry Stretton, M.A., 194.
- Ireland, a Fortnight in.** By Sir Francis B. Head, 369.
- Ireland, a History of.** Edited by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, M.A., 200.
- Irish Church, the; its History and Statistics.** By William Shee, Sergeant at Law, M.P., 369.
- Jackson**—*Stories and Catechising in Illustration of the Collects; or, A Year with the First Class Boys of Forley.* Vol. i. Edited by the Rev. William Jackson, M.A., 197.
- Jameson**—*The Analogy between the Miracles and Doctrines of Scripture.* By the Rev. Francis J. Jameson, B.A., 204.
- Jebb**—*A Plea for what is left of the Cathedrals.* By the Rev. J. Jebb, 214.
- Johnson, a Memoir of the Rev. W. A. B., Missionary of the Church Missionary Society, in Regent's Town, Sierra Leone.** By the Rev. W. Jowett, M.A., 354.
- Jowett**—*A Memoir of the Rev. W. A. B. Johnson, Missionary of the Church Missionary Society, in Regent's Town, Sierra Leone.* By the Rev. W. Jowett, M.A., 354.
- Keating**—*Sermons for Several Sundays.* By William Keating, M.A., 211.
- Keble**—*A Letter to Sir Brook W. Brydges.* By John Keble, M.A., 116.
- Kempe**—*A Sermon on the Proposal to Open the Crystal Palace on the Lord's Day.* By the Rev. J. E. Kempe, 464.
- Kingsley**—*Phaethon.* By the Rev. C. Kingsley, 464.
- Kingsley**—*Sermons on National Subjects; preached in a Village Church.* By Charles Kingsley, Rector of Eversley, 267.
- Knox**—"The Six Days." By Captain Charles Knox, 463.
- Lew-Chew, Narrative of a Visit to.** By the Bishop of Victoria, 463.
- Lincoln, History of the Bishopric of, from its commencement at Sidnaceaster in Lindisse, &c.** By Adam Stark, 192.
- Little Ruth Gray,** 214.
- London City Mission, Reports of the,** 1.
- London Labour and the London Poor.** By Henry Mayhew, 1.
- Lord's Supper, a Companion to the.** By the Rev. G. F. De Teissier, M.A., 211.
- Lord's Supper, the,** 451.
- Marriott**—*A Sermon on the Common Prayer.* By the Rev. J. P. Marriott, 464.
- Martin**—*A Place of Repentance; or an Account of the London Colonial Training Institution and Ragged Dormitory, for the Reformation of Youthful and*

- Adult Male Criminals, Great South Street, Westminster.* By Samuel Martin, Minister of Westminster Chapel, 197.
- Mayhew—London Labour and the London Poor.* By Henry Mayhew, 1.
- Mayhew—Low Wages; the Causes and Consequences of them, &c.* By Henry Mayhew, 1.
- McCorry—The Supremacy of St. Peter, &c.* Lectures delivered by the Rev. John S. McCorry, M.Ap., 204.¹
- Melbourne—Charge.* By the Right Rev. Dr. Perry, Bishop of Melbourne, 213.
- Meyrick—The Practical Working of the Church in Spain.* By the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A., 56.
- Michaud's History of the Crusades.* Translated from the French by W. Robson, 203.
- Miller—Sermon on the Death of the Duke of Wellington.* By the Rev. E. Miller, 464.
- Milton Davenant; a Tale of the Times we live in.* By the Rev. James Bandinel, 317.
- Milton's Paradise Lost, The Fall of Man, from.* By the Rev. Charles Eyre, A.B., 435.
- Miracles and Doctrines of Scripture, the Analogy between the.* By the Rev. Francis J. Jameson, B.A., 204.
- Money and its Influences. A Tale.* Translated from the German by a Lady, 198.
- Montgomery—The Hero's Funeral. A Poem.* By Robert Montgomery, M.A., 430.
- Moultrie—Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Rugby.* By the Rev. J. Moultrie, M.A., Rector of Rugby, 198.
- Murray—Original Views of Passages in the Life and Writings of the Poet-Philosopher of Venusia; with which is combined an Illustration of the Suitability of the Ancient Epic and Lyric styles, to Modern Subjects of National and General Interest.* By John Murray, M.A., 147.
- Neale—Lectures principally on the Church Difficulties of the Present Time.* By the Rev. J. M. Neale, M.A., 195.
- Neander—Life and Times of St. Bernard.* By Augustus Neander. Translated from the German by Matilda Wrench, 201.
- Nicene Creed, a Short explanation of the, for the use of persons beginning the Study of Theology.* By A. P. Forbes, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin, 200.
- Oremus; Short Prayers in Verse for Sundays and Holidays, suggested by the Services of the Church of England,* 212.
- Parish, our New—Its Privileges and Progress.* By Harriet E. Fourdrinier, 209.
- Parker—A Discourse of matters pertaining to Religion.* By Theodore Parker, Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury, 438.
- Pastoral Theology; the Theory of Gospel Ministry.* By A. Vinet, Prof. of Theology at Lausanne. Translated from the French, 201.
- Paul—Christian Union, its Necessity, the Grounds on which it may be hoped for, and the Obstacles to its attainment, &c.; Six Sermons.* By the Rev. J. Paul, B.A., 197.
- Pearce—Auricular Confession, &c.* By William Pearce, Esq., 208.
- Pears—The Protestant Theory of Church Music.* By the Rev. S. N. Pears, 464.
- Penitents, Tracts for,* 451.
- Penny Post, the; September 1852,* 186. 429.
- Pentateuch and its Assailants, the; a Refutation of the Objections of Modern Scepticism to the Pentateuch.* By William T. Hamilton, D.D., 434.
- Philosophy of the Italian Schools, the; Letters to Prof. G. M. Bertini.* By Ausonio Franchi, 454.
- Physical Astronomy, History of, from the Earliest Ages to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century.* By Robert Grant, F.R.A.S., 210.
- Pound—The Ancient Practice and Proposed Revival of Diocesan Synods in England.* By William Pound, M.A., 166.
- Pound—The Papal Aggression to be met by the Revival of Diocesan Synods.* By the Rev. W. Pound, 214.
- Princesses of England from the Norman Conquest, Lives of the.* By Mary Anne Everett Green, 206.
- Psalter, the English; Adapted to the Ancient Ecclesiastical Chants; Specimens, with the Preface and Introduction,* 211.
- Pusey—Letters of the Rev. Dr. Pusey to the Earl of Shaftesbury and Sir John Romilly, on their Imputations against the Tractarians, with Sir John Romilly's Answer,* 199.
- Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, Extracts from; intended chiefly for the use of the Managers and Teachers*

- of such Elementary Schools as are not receiving Government Aid*, 202.
- Reuben Medlicote; or the Coming Man.* By M. N. Savage, Esq., 429.
- Revealed Economy of Heaven and Earth*, 463.
- Revelation of St. John the Divine, Thoughts on some portions of the.* By the Rev. Edward Huntingford, B.C.L., 208.
- Rhodes—Handbook to Convocation.* By Henry J. Rhodes, M.A., 438.
- Richardson—A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Shaftesbury on the Establishment of Ragged School Churches.* By the Rev. W. E. Richardson, B.A., 435.
- Robertson—Periodical Savings.* By Alexander Robertson, 214.
- Robson—Wieland's History of the Crusades.* Translated from the French by W. Robson, 203.
- Romanism an Apostate Church.* By Non Clericus, 448.
- St. Bernard, Life and Times of.* By Augustus Neander. Translated from the German, by Matilda Wrench, 201.
- Saints our Example, the.* By the Author of "Letters on Happiness," 201.
- Sandford—An Attempt to illustrate the Chronology of the Old Testament by a Reference to the Year of Jubilee.* By the Rev. G. B. Sandford, M.A., 198.
- Savage—Reuben Medlicote; or the Coming Man.* By M. N. Savage, Esq., 429.
- Scripture Catechism on the Church, a; wherein the Answers are given in the Words of the Bible*, 451.
- Sermons on National Subjects; Preached in a Village Church.* By Charles Kingsley, Rector of Eversley, Hants, 267.
- Sermons on the Irish Church.* By the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth, 369.
- Servants in Great Britain, a Short Letter to the,* 214.
- Shee—The Irish Church, its History and Statistics.* By William Shee, Serjeant-at-Law, M.P. 369.
- Shee, Reply to Sergeant.* By Archdeacon Stopford, 369.
- Shepherd—Letter to the Rev. S. R. Maitland on St. Cyprian's Works*, 464.
- Simon—The Mission and Martyrdom of St. Peter.* By T. Collins Simon, 464.
- Simpson—Lectures on the Typical Character of the Jewish Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Sacrifices.* By Foster G. Simpson, B.A., 208.
- Smith—A Complete Greek and English Lexicon for the Poems of Homer, and the Homeridæ, &c.* By G. Ch. Crusius. Translated from the German, by Henry Smith. Edited by the Rev. T. K. Arnold, 434.
- Smith—An Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Creed of the Church of Rome, Part III. The Sacrifices of the Mass and Transubstantiation.* By Charles Smith, B.D., 212.
- Smith—A smaller Classical Dictionary of Biography, Mythology, and Geography.* Abridged from the larger Dictionary by William Smith, LL.D., 209.
- Smith—The Temptation of our Blessed Lord. A Series of Lectures.* By the Rev. T. Tunstall Smith, M.A., 194.
- Snape—Lectures on the Principles of Action in the Conduct of Life.* By R. Snape, 464.
- Sortain—Sermon on the Death of the Duke of Wellington.* By Mr. Sortain, 464.
- Sparks—A Reply to the Strictures of Lord Mahon on the Life of Washington.* By Jared Sparks, 464.
- Stark—History of the Bishopric of Lincoln from its commencement at Sidnacester in Lindisse, &c.* By Adam Stark, 192.
- State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity, on the,* 194.
- Stirling—The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles the Fifth.* By William Stirling, 437.
- Stopford—Reply to Serjeant Shee.* By Archdeacon Stopford, 369.
- Stories and Catechisings in Illustration of the Collects; or a Year with the First Class Boys of Forley.* Edited by the Rev. W. Jackson, M.A., 197.
- Stowe—Uncle Tom's Cabin; or, Negro Life in the Slave States of America.* By Harriet Beecher Stowe, 80.
- Stretton—A Guide to Infirm, Sick, and Dying Members of the Church of England.* By Henry Stretton, M.A., 122.
- Sunlight in the Clouds. Some Providences in a Lifetime, &c.,* 206.
- Suckling, a short Memoir of the Rev. R. A.* By the Rev. Isaac Williams, B.D., 204.
- Talfourd—The Dramatic Works of Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd, D.C.L.* Eleventh Edition, to which are added a few Sonnets and Verses, 443.
- Talfourd—Vacation Rambles. Comprising the Recollections of Three Continental Tours in the Vacations of 1841—1843.* By Sir T. N. Talfourd, 447.
- Tate—Sermon on the Death of the Duke*

- of Wellington.* By the Rev. N. Tate, 464.
- Taylor—The Emphatic New Testament, according to the Authorized Version, compared with the Various Readings of the Vatican Manuscript.* Edited, with an Introductory Essay on Greek Emphasis, by John Taylor, 210.
- Taylor—What is Education? A Letter to the Earl of Derby.* By the Rev. J. Taylor, M.A., 214.
- Teaching of the Meeting House and Teaching of the Church,* 214.
- Temptation of our Blessed Lord, the. A Series of Lectures.* By the Rev. T. Tunstall Smith, M.A., 194.
- Ten Commandments, the,* 451.
- Tennyson—Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington.* By Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate, 425.
- Thiersch—The Church in the Apostolic Age.* By Henry W. J. Thiersch. Translated from the German. By Thomas Carlyle, Esq., 433.
- Thompson—Israel Hartmann, as Youth, Husband, and Orphan Schoolmaster. A Biography from his Diary and Letters.* Translated from the German by Mr. Thompson. With a Preface by the Rev. Robert Bickersteth, M.A., 195.
- Thoughts in Past Years.* By the Author of "The Cathedral." Sixth Edition, 452.
- Tracts for Penitents,* 451.
- Trevor—The Convocation of the Two Provinces; their Origin, Constitution, and Forms of Proceeding; with a Chapter on their Revival.* By George Trevor, M.A., Canon of York, 435.
- Truth and Unity, The Claims of; Charge.* By the Archbishop of Dublin, 213.
- Tyler—The Christian's Hope in Death; a Series of Sermons on the Burial Service of the Church of England.* By J. Endell Tyler, B.D., 38.
- Tyler—The Rector's Address to his Parishioners of St. Giles's-in-the-Fields.* By J. Endell Tyler, B.D., 38.
- Typical Character of the Jewish Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Sacrifices, Lectures on.* By Forster G. Simpson, B.A., 208.
- Tupper—A Dirge for Wellington.* By M. F. Tupper, 464.
- Uncle Tom's Cabin; or, Negro Life in the Slave States of America.* By Harriet Beecher Stowe, 80.
- Vacation Rambles; comprising the Recollections of Three Continental Tours in the Vacations of 1841—1843.* By Sir T. N. Talfourd, D.C.L., 447.
- Vanderkiste—Notes and Narratives of Labours in the London City Mission.* By Mr. Vanderkiste, 463.
- Vinet—Pastoral Theology; the Theory of a Gospel Ministry.* By A. Vinet, Professor of Theology at Lausanne. Translated from the French, 201.
- Visiting and Relief Association, Annual Reports of the Metropolitan, for 1850 and 1851,* 1.
- Wagner—Sermons to Children, preached in St. Stephen's Church, Brighton.* By the Rev. George Wagner, M.A., 450.
- Walks after Wild Flowers; or, the Botany of the Bohereens.* By Richard Dowden (Richard), 206.
- Watson—Public Ordinances and Effectual Administration of Divine Pardon.* By the Rev. Alexander Watson, 213.
- Webb—Suggestions on the Present Condition of Ireland, and on Government Aid for carrying out an efficient Railway System.* By C. Locock Webb, Esq., 214.
- Webster—An Evangelical Ministry the Strength of the Nation.* By the Rev. W. Webster, M.A., 213.
- Wells—Charge of the Archdeacon of,* 213.
- Wheeler—Some Objections to the Revival of Ecclesiastical Synods Answered.* A Sermon by the Rev. J. D. Wheeler, M.A., 166.
- Wilberforce—The Appeal to Convocation.* A Charge by the Rev. Robert J. Wilberforce, Archdeacon of the East Riding, 166.
- Wilkinson—School Sermons, preached in the Chapel of Marlborough College.* By Matthew Wilkinson, D.D., Master of Marlborough College, 207.
- Willamy—Hints on Education.* By J. Willamy, 214.
- Williams—A Short Memoir of the Rev. R. A. Suckling, M.A.* By the Rev. Isaac Williams, B.D., 204.
- Woodward—Sermons Doctrinal and Practical.* By the Rev. W. Archer Butler, M.A. Edited by the Rev. T. Woodward, M.A., 209.
- Woodward—Sermons. Second Series. Preached at Rome during the seasons of 1850-1851, and 1851-1852.* By Francis B. Woodward, M.A., 437.
- Words of Advice and Warning,* 451.

Wordsworth—Occasional Sermons preached in Westminster. Fourth Series. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. On the Church of Ireland, 206.

Wordsworth, Rev. Dr., Sermons on the Irish Church, 369.

Wrench—Life and Times of St. Bernard. By Augustus Neander. Translated from the German by Matilda Wrench, 291.

Wright—Course of the History of Modern Philosophy. By M. Cousin. Translated by Mr. Wright, 464.

THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1852.

ART. I.—1. *London Labour and the London Poor.* By HENRY MAYHEW. Office, 16, Wellington-street, Strand.

2.—*Low Wages: the Causes and Consequences of them, &c.* By HENRY MAYHEW.

3.—*Annual Reports, for 1850 and 1851, of the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association.*

4.—*Reports of the London City Mission.*

THE wants and sufferings, the habits and dispositions, the rights and duties of the poor, the past, present, and future of our working classes, but more especially the present, this is always the theme to which we recur with most active interest, and which, we think, must occupy more than all others the minds of those persons who are not living for self alone, but are anxious to promote God's glory and the happiness of their fellow-creatures. And this applies equally to laity and clergy. It is indeed the peculiar duty of the latter, their prerogative and their glory, to be the friends of the distressed in hours of need, their advocates, and their representatives amongst their more fortunate brethren. But every man or woman, and we might almost say every child, of the educated classes, (not that that term is any longer applicable in any strict, exclusive sense to the upper and middle ranks of society,) is bound to take an active interest in the welfare of the millions who throng the back streets and alleys of our crowded cities, or dwell in the myriad hamlets that stud the surface of our native land.

We do not wish to exaggerate evils; to make things appear in any degree worse than they really are; very far from it: but there is great need, indeed, for change in almost all respects in the condition of our working classes, whether urban or rural, agricultural, metropolitan, or manufacturing. On the one hand, we are assured, whether rightly or not, by political economists who have deeply studied the subject, that the wealth of the British Empire is vastly on the increase; on the other, we witness no advance, but rather, it is to be feared, a constant retrogression in the moral, social, and religious condition of those whom we may aptly call the Poor.

Perhaps there is no class of men who see more of the now existing misery, irreligion, and vice, and who are on the whole more unexceptionable witnesses to the sad fact, than the parochial

clergy, together with their invaluable coadjutors the parish-doctors of the land. We do not use this last expression unadvisedly ; for personal experience has convinced us that where the clergyman and the parish-doctor work cordially together, far more satisfactory results may be attained than by the single efforts of either of the twain. The voices of *all* witnesses, lay and clerical, seem, however, to concur in bearing testimony to the alarming nature of the evils we deplore. Mr. Henry Mayhew, in his admirable work on London Labour and the London Poor, a work by no means confined to that one theme, but treating the whole question of Labour in the most impartial and comprehensive strain, and depicting the state of the followers of well-nigh every calling throughout the land, has brought together a multitude of apparently incontestable facts and figures, which seem to demonstrate that the working classes have been for many years past sinking lower and lower in the social scale, whilst the capital of the country has been simultaneously on the increase ; that the rich have been growing richer and the poor poorer ; and that a very abyss of social misery exists in the centre of civilized life, down which hundreds and thousands of victims are incessantly sinking into the deep recesses of despair. He appears to attribute these social evils (with what correctness it is not for us now to say) to the unrestricted influence of competition, and to think that unless the legislature intervenes in some way in the defence of Labour against Capital, we must expect a revolutionary rising of the masses, sooner or later, and the overthrow of our existing institutions. So much, alas ! is certain : the poor of our cities have already ceased to value, for the more part, those institutions, in either Church or State ; they have withdrawn themselves *within themselves*, and, trenched in sullen indifference or heedlessness of mood, they form a nation of their own, distinct from those above them and around them, an "imperium in imperio" of the very worst and most dangerous order. Miserably housed, large families in our cities rarely occupying more than one apartment, in city or country never more than two, (with some few extraordinary exceptions,) father, mother, boys and girls, from the age of twenty to that of the infant in arms, all living, eating and drinking, and sleeping in one low and narrow and necessarily very dirty room, (in a large London parish we know only of some half-dozen exceptions !) self-respect becomes virtually impossible ; religious habits seem, if possible, to be still more so ; good temper is preserved with the utmost difficulty, nay, humanly speaking, it cannot be preserved in the great majority of instances ; there is no shadow, in fine, of ease or of comfort. Conceive the wretchedness of such a *home* as this ! Can you wonder, O stern moralist !

that the mother of such a family, condemned to drudge from morning to night, in such a fetid atmosphere, with bad smells all about her, open sewers immediately beneath her window, filth grimed in the very walls and floors, should escape to the gin-palaces, to seek in the intoxicating draught a momentary relaxation from that dull monotonous weight of wretched poverty, which perpetually hangs about her, and weighs her to the dust. But so, you say, she makes herself poorer. Granted : but could *you* live, think you, without *some* pleasures, some *enjoyment*, however innocent and simple ? This poor creature has none, save this ; one which is at once her only solace and her bitterest bane. Or, take the case of the labouring man, who has risen with the sun, and gone forth to his (doubtless) healthful toils. Remember what air he has slept in on the night before, remember the home he has to return to, the total absence of ease, or quiet, or cleanliness, or comfort of any kind, the certainty that he will find a slatternly wife and filthy children in a close and fetid atmosphere where every breath is poison, and then condemn him, if you can (we cannot), when he resorts to the alehouse on the way ! Where else is he to repair ? You have no public gardens for him, where, by the payment of a penny, or some such small coin, he could obtain entrance and even take his wife and children with him for a stroll to hear a band of music play, and purchase a cheap meal of tea or coffee, and bread and butter, or fruit and milk, such gardens as are to be found throughout the length and breadth of Germany. Tens of thousands of rich men annually go abroad and witness the superior welfare of the continental working classes ; but not one of them has the heart to provide, or attempt to provide, the like blessings for his English brethren. No, the traveller quiets his conscience with the reflection that England is no country for out-door amusements, and then returns to drive for two or three hours a day unconcernedly in the parks throughout the season ; or perhaps he grieves that our poor should be “ so very vulgar,” so “ unfortunately offensive in their manners,” that they cannot be allowed to enter the places of public resort attended by the wealthier classes, as they do in well-nigh all the other lands of Europe ; not reflecting that, as far as there is any truth at all in this cruel and bitter charge, it is the result of the sinful separation of rich and poor, which no where takes such a glaringly antichristian aspect as in this the boasted home of liberty. But to return from this digression, you have no gardens, we say, for the working man, where he might breathe a little fresh air after the toils of the day, and rejoice in the good looks and happy faces of his wife and children. The parks do not at all answer this purpose for him, useful as they are in their

way, because people do not obtain tea and coffee there at cheap rates, and this is absolutely essential for the attraction of the working classes. Your theatres again (for we will even mention them) are noisy, glaring places, redolent of gas and all abominations, thorough contrasts to the quiet, soberly-lighted, well-ventilated German theatre, in which it is really a pleasure to sit, and to which the poorest frequently resort; with this all-important difference between the two, that the one terminates at half-past nine and the other at twelve o'clock: for in Germany going to the play is really a natural and healthful recreation; in England it is destructive of health and injurious to the morals, especially, of course, in the case of penny theatres, which are sinks of abomination. Where, we ask once more, is the working man to go for recreation? Even your churches are all closed: he cannot enter there to breathe a quiet prayer in peace, to listen to the chanting of the evening psalms, so still and soft and holy, as he can abroad, or to join in the well-loved evening hymn, dearer and more dear from constant use and affectionate familiarity; or to hear the word of God read in its own emphatic force and majesty; or to join in the Church's solemn prayers; or to listen, if he so will, to an unpretending and affectionate exposition of that word, which should be kept apart, as far as possible, from the evening service, so as to render the listening to it a matter altogether optional. Surely the church should be the poor man's home, if he have no other; surely there he should find open doors and an inviting seat; there he should be able to sit and meditate, if he so would, in quiet, or to join in some life-giving service, or kneel in silent solitary prayer. We wish to render it obvious, that the mere opening of our churches in cities for half an hour for the saying of the evening prayers, and then closing them again, cannot at all meet the necessities of the case, though it be better than doors closed altogether. What we need is an open church; open, at all events, *throughout the evening hours*, as long as daylight lasts in the summer, and till nine o'clock at least in the depths of winter.

But when we have flung wide our doors, then the work is but begun; for, alas! we have a heathenized population to deal with. It wrings the heart to think of the condition of our English masses. They seem to have no joys, for the more part, save those of the beasts that perish. Our past coldness and neglect have expelled them from our churches. From Sunday to Sunday these churches have been closed, and on the Christian Sabbath, exclusive pews, pews appropriated to the wealthy and the powerful in this world, have blocked up the sanctuary of the Lord. And in the meanwhile, whilst they were thus cruelly driven from all

places of public prayer, (for the chapels of dissent also are *necessarily* appropriated to the use of those who support them, nor is any blame to be attached to them on this score,) social evils were pressing more and more heavily on the devoted heads of our unhappy working classes. Those, whose duty it was to attend to their condition, neglected them. Their numbers were constantly and largely on the increase, and this our statesmen, this the nation knew, and yet no effort was made by the wise or the benevolent to increase their means of house accommodation. The space appropriated to each family grew smaller and smaller, till at last they were confined to residence in a single room; and then all other evils, moral, social, and religious, followed of necessity.

If trouble arising from incompatibilities of temperament and haste of temper are experienced even by the wealthy in their wider dwellings, where they can separate and repair to their private apartments at will and pleasure, think, reader, what evils must necessarily accrue, where all are confined in one narrow and dirty chamber by night and day. Can you suppose that under such circumstances the use of passionate epithets and bitter reproaches will be avoided? or that any due check can be put on them when once resorted to? And how, think you, is the innocence of childhood to survive under such circumstances? How are children to respect, or how are they likely to obey, the parents whom they hear so frequently abusing one another? How is private prayer to be maintained in such a household? You, dear madam, who circulate your tracts and pronounce your censures with such an air of mild authority and wisdom, do you really think, in your heart of hearts, that the mother of the family is so inexcusable as you say she is, because she does not keep her children in order and rule her household carefully? We must confess, that we have often been surprised to listen to the condemnation which kind-hearted, earnest-hearted Christian men and women, who visit the poor, will deal upon their heads on the score of their sad vices. "Oh, that woman is a drunkard, I know; I saw her in a state of intoxication with my own eyes; she shall never again have a shilling of mine." O Christian! dost thou judge as thou wouldst be judged? Think of thy own infirmities; think of thy own pleasures, of thine own social happiness; and then consider the wretched lot of this miserable creature; and, believe us, you will never reform her by severity. Strive to amend her lot; and then, by God's grace, she may, and possibly will, reform herself. But in the meanwhile be charitable, be *over kind*, be blind, if you so will! run the risk of encouraging vice, rather than that of leaving a fellow-creature to despair.

Of course we speak with reference to relief administered in the houses of the poor, and to those whom we are in a measure acquainted with ; we would not encourage indiscriminate almsgiving in the public street, though we should hold that to be better than none at all. We are firmly persuaded that the majority of our working classes, at least in our large towns and cities, are now in such a heathenized condition, that we can scarcely be too charitable to their failings. If the clergyman use that visitation from house to house, which is, in our opinion, his bounden duty, mainly for the purpose of rebuke and exhortation to amendment, he will, in our belief, effect more harm than good. Even if he accompanies these reproofs with gifts, he will still excite a feeling of irritation in the hearts of those he speaks to ; for the consciences of these, our poorer brethren, are not acute, their self-respect is gone, while pride and self-righteousness, ever natural to the heart of man, endure ; the more deeply such men and women are sunk in degradation, the more ready they will be found to defend themselves ; the more firmly persuaded they are (and that not without reason) that neither the Church nor the State has performed its duty towards them, and that they owe no vindication of their conduct to their supposed enemies and oppressors.

It has been said that true saints only can reform sinners, because such saints are ever at once the humblest and most charitable of mankind, the most eager to recognize whatever lingering good abides in a sinful brother, the first to feel that under the like circumstances they might have fallen into the same transgressions ; but we cannot think that it needs any especial saintliness to deal mildly and charitably with the errors and failings of the poor, remembering what they are, and how gross are their temptations. We do not envy the feelings of the man or woman who can enter the labourer's dwelling and view the squalid misery around—the wretched baby clinging to the pale and weary mother's breast, the shoeless children, the broken panes stuffed with old papers, the apology for a fire—and can make his or her first greeting an inquiry, whether the wretched people were at church or no last Sunday evening, or some other question that conveys a rebuke of these miserable outcasts of society. We do not claim a kinder heart than our neighbours ; very far from it : the constant sight of wretchedness is apt, we fear, to harden ; but, we ask, is severity in its right place, can it be so, in such a case ? Should not the visitor, whether lay or clerical, having taken care in the first instance, usually speaking, to remove his hat—for the poor, though they may not resent openly, feel deeply all slights which remind them of their miserable inferiority in

rank and fortune, they are more tenacious on such subjects even than the rich, more scrupulous to speak of one another as Mr. Brady and Mrs. Johnson, or even as that gentleman and that lady—should not the visitor, we say, take the offered chair, and, speaking cheerfully and hopefully—for it is no use to give way to the melancholy impressions which such a scene will naturally call forth—inquire the health and present prospects of the family? whether the husband is in work, and so forth? This should be done, we repeat, in a cheerful tone, so as not to encourage begging; not monotonously, as though we were preaching a dull sermon, or performing some other painful duty; or wearily, as though we were about to faint. We should feel as the friends of the poor creatures we address; and then we shall speak as friends: this is perhaps the only true receipt. Probably, we may then have to listen to some tale of want; and in the vast majority of cases that want will be real, even though there may be some exaggeration. We have met, on the other hand, with many poor people, even in one of the worst parts of London, who needed pressing to reveal the whole extent of their sufferings. Often, of course, there will be much to repel in the aspect of affairs, the look of the woman, and the children, and the room; often, doubtless, there may be much of actual vice, drunkenness, and bad management of every kind. But as a general rule we should say, relieve! Prove that your object is not to gratify curiosity, not to go about preaching, and rebuking, and exalting yourself at the expense of your neighbours. Give a shilling, or half-a-crown, as the case may be; and make no parade of your gift; slip it into the hand of the mother of the family, if possible before you are asked for it, when it will come with a far better grace, and go on, in the same moment, to make some general observation as to the air of the room, or health of the children, or work of the father of the family. Disclaim thanks, but not rudely so. If, as will sometimes be the case (we speak from experience), the recipient appear oppressed with the weight of obligation,—we *have* seen men, rough, hard men, shed tears on such occasions,—it may be well to observe *cheerfully* that we are all bound to help one another, and that you have no doubt the family you are now relieving have often helped their neighbours in distress. The remembrance of this fact, for a fact it will be in nine cases out of ten, at least amongst the poor who live in cities, and who are very kind and charitable to one another, will remove any painful sense of degradation which an honest working man, who earns his livelihood in the sweat of his brow, will sometimes feel from being constrained to receive charity from a stranger.

A clergyman, it is true, if he knows how to make his own position felt, will never appear a stranger : even those amongst the working classes who never pass a church's threshold from month to month, and year to year, still recognize the clergyman as their natural friend, though too frequently an assumption of stern dignity and of aristocratic importance on the part of the clergy may repel their sympathies, and lead the poor to withdraw within themselves.

This is perhaps the proper place to say that we can in no way sanction or approve of an opinion which appears to have been gaining ground of late in certain profoundly High-Church quarters, that it is a great hardship, as we have heard it expressed, that clergymen should be called upon to act as almoners ! Certain theorists contend that the priestly office is practically merged, at present, in that which rightly pertains to the diaconate ; that the deacons, or lay visitors, should relieve all the temporal wants of the poor, so that it should be clearly understood that whenever the parish priest makes his entrance into the house of a poor man, he comes exclusively in his spiritual capacity, to visit and to pray with the sick, or to rebuke, or encourage, as the occasion may seem to demand. We have heard it argued, that because a clergyman never knows, at present, what he is called for by the poor, whether in his spiritual or temporal capacity, as priest or as almoner, he should put the direct question first of all in so many words, whether he was sent for for the sake of his money or no ; as if men's motives were not always more or less mixed ; as if there were something incompatible in poverty which craved assistance, and dull misery of heart and soul which looked for ghostly consolation. The truth is, that, under existing circumstances, heathenized as the great body of our working classes are, at least in towns, the clergyman's services would scarcely ever be called for at all did he not bear the purse, and his presence would be rarely welcome ; that is, amongst the very poor, where discomfort and disorder reign, where he is most needed in every sense. Amongst those who are comparatively comfortable we can bear witness to the fact that he is usually welcomed gladly as a friend ; only the more so perhaps because such persons are under no pressing sense of obligation ! The housewife will array her face in smiles, and bring her best chair forward with pride, and feel exceedingly gratified by such a friendly visit, paid, be it understood, not for the purpose of reproof, or of sermonising, or of catechisation, as to the regularity of her and her husband's attendance at church ; and the husband, should he be in the way, will not be the less gratified by such a mark of interest and attention. But the really poor, those who are struggling with the

hardships of an adverse lot, will see with secret displeasure the frequent entrance of those who come not to relieve, but, as they will be sure to conclude, to spy out their infirmities, and scan the nakedness of the land. Money, it has been said with truth, is an "open sesame," and it is one which the parish priest in crowded cities cannot possibly dispense with in his visits from house to house and room to room. Nor can the calls of any district visitors, in our judgment, however frequent, supply the place of the visits of the parish priest. These are most valuable, most essential auxiliaries, but, after all, they are auxiliaries only: it is the clergyman himself in whom our working classes should be taught to confide, as a counsellor and a friend; to him should they make their wants and distresses known; to him should they state their wants whenever any unexpected emergency arises. In the absence of direct spiritual intercourse, at stated intervals, betwixt pastor and people (as it is practised, we understand, most successfully, and under an apparently unexceptionable form, in the parish of Harrow Weald, no private absolution being administered), it is manifest that visiting from house to house supplies the only direct medium of communication betwixt a clergyman and his people. Can it, then, be seriously contended that this ought to be abandoned to laymen and women, or to the youngest and most inexperienced amongst the clergy, or to an inferior permanent order of deacons, appointed to act as almoners? This injudicious notion of the revival of an Apostolic practice is manifestly based upon a total miscomprehension of our existing needs, and of the vast practical difference betwixt the case of a parish priest, responsible for the spiritual and moral well-being of all the souls entrusted to his charge, and that of the twelve governors and universal bishops of the Church, whose time was necessarily occupied with the discharge of their spiritual functions. The parish priest, or the curate, as he is called, (for every priest has bound himself by the most solemn obligation to devote his hours and days to the saving of souls, and wherever a man's line may happen to be cast, there is he bound to *work*,) is, in our judgment, under the most positive obligation to make himself personally acquainted, as far as possible, with the individuals resident in his parish or district, with them, their wants, and their distresses; and this he can only do by visiting, on some system, from street to street, and house to house, and room to room, and in the largest of parishes we cannot admit him to be exempted from this duty; he is still bound to work as far as his force will carry him. It is astonishing, indeed, how much may be accomplished in this way by a little good will, aided by an honest resolve, and a certain

amount of moral courage. In large city parishes, doubtless, it will be quite necessary to call in the assistance of laymen ; and sometimes, it may be added, laymen who go to poor people's houses as parochial visitors need be under less apprehension than clergymen of appearing indelicate, or of buying attention to the duties of religion by relief, when they find occasion for urging on those they visit the obligation and the privilege of attending service in God's house. Reprimands, indeed, will usually fall ill from the lips of lay people ; the poor know that they have in no sense authority over them, and that they are not bound to render account to such censurers of their sayings and doing. None can speak to the labouring classes with such a mixture of familiarity and command as the clergy ; they stand at once in some measure, by virtue of their office, on a level with the poorest of the poor, so as to have the right to elicit their sympathies and demand their confidences ; theirs is the privilege of lowliness, if they knew how to employ it, whilst they retain at the same time the dignity of their office, and that social superiority which gentlemanly manners, and the sense of a liberal education, must confer. A clergyman cannot lower himself, God be praised for it, so long as he acts in a religious spirit, by placing himself on an equality with the poor, by extending to them the hand of friendship, by asking their advice even in practical matters, by speaking to them as a workman to his fellow-workmen ! The more he does this in a hearty honest Christian spirit, the more he identifies himself with the joys, and sorrows, and interests of labour, the more will he be *respected*, both as a clergyman and as a gentleman. We do not speak of love ; that follows as of course ; and it is astonishing to reflect how much love may be won at how little cost ! The poor are often not loud in their expressions of gratitude ; all show is hostile to our national character ; sometimes to the eye of the dull observer they may almost seem sullen and ungrateful, when in reality a quiet steadfast flame of affection is kindled within their hearts. When a working clergyman has left a parish, go into it years after, and you will probably hear his praises sounded with a warmth of expression that will startle you, and would make that clergyman, were he a listener, blush with shame. As Wordsworth says, it is the gratitude, and not the ingratitude of men, which leaves us mourning ; because such warmth of affection, in return for such slight services, services which he who has rendered them knows perhaps to be miserably inefficient and insufficient, seems a melancholy earnest that many of his brethren cannot attempt to discharge their vows at all, since such a partial, a very partial compliance with the call of duty, is magnified by the poor, and perhaps by the world also, into a case of exalted

piety and virtue. Is not this sad indeed? sad enough to wring bitter tears of self-reproach from the recesses of too many hearts and consciences? But, we repeat, the clergyman cannot thus visit from house to house, as he should do, and make himself the personal friend and confidant of his people,—an office and a privilege which he should yield to none,—unless he bears with him the means of relieving their distresses. To abdicate this office in favour of another, is an act of virtual self-annihilation in his capacity as parish priest. To discharge the public functions of the Church, to deliver his message from the pulpit, or even to offer the great commemorative service, that highest office of the Christian priesthood, all these are privileges, doubtless, and privileges that may and will endear him to many hearts and souls. But the poor need to be sought in their own homes. There is an obligation on the faithful minister of Christ to go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in.

Yet we must guard against discouragement in case of *this* result being attained with great difficulty and slowness. As long as the poor are cooped together, as at present, large families within four narrow walls, habits of devotion or of self-respect are barely possible. On the very first emergency, and, alas! such emergencies will be constantly recurring, the Sunday clothes are taken to the pawnbroker's, and then all chance of attendance at a place of public worship seems to be taken away. In their dirty week-day clothing, so often ragged and unseemly, our working classes will *not* make their appearance, on a Sunday, either in church, or out of doors at all. They prefer to pass the whole day lounging on their beds, or sitting in disconsolate dulness in their narrow chambers. And how can we blame them? Alas! we have not opened our churches at early morn and close of day, when special services *might* have been provided for the poor. And now the former, at least, would be attempted vainly; at all events for a long time to come, until we have made a serious impression by other means, because our poor have lost the habit of rising early in the morning, when they are not constrained by the calls of labour so to do. It is not thus, however, with the poor Romanist in the metropolis or elsewhere; at the seven and eight o'clock masses, on Sunday morning, you will find immense congregations of the poorest of the poor in all their London chapels. It is true, indeed, that attendance at this service may be practically regarded by them in the light of an "*opus operatum*," an actual piece of work, which, being discharged, leaves the conscience free for the remainder of the day: it is also true (we speak from personal observation, and the impartial reports of neighbours) that the Roman Catholic poor, after attendance at

this early service, treat the Sundays as virtually over, and too often return to their homes to drink and riot for the whole remainder of the day ; still a sense of religious obligation is something, and we do not wish to undervalue it. Our poor have not this sense of the necessity of attending in God's house at all ; usually speaking, they have a strong feeling of the desirability of being self-consistent. If they have got drunk over night, as is too frequently the case—for Saturday evening is the time of payment, and then when the money comes in, a strong temptation presents itself, and where there is little religious principle, it would be wonderful indeed if that temptation were subdued—then the poor who belong to our communion think in their hearts that they would only add to their sins by joining in the Church's public services ; they know, what the Roman Catholic poor of the same class do not know, that the mere utterance of a certain number of prayers will not suffice to avert God's wrath or win his favour. Often they will tell you, and tell you honestly, that they are no hypocrites, that they do not pretend to be better than they are, that they are not worthy of being church-goers. And yet all the while they acquiesce contentedly enough in this unworthiness of theirs ; they tell themselves that their hard lot will surely plead their excuse in the eyes of God, that they are no worse than their neighbours, that they are in fact the victims of circumstances. And though their responsibility still remains, and we are bound to remind them of the fact, yet can we find it in our hearts to express a harsh condemnation of these unhappy wanderers from the fold ? It is our duty to open wide our doors to receive them as returning penitents : but even if they will not come, let us not be vexed and impatient, let us not be weary in well-doing ! We speak here to those who have taken on them the obligation of assisting and visiting the poor, whether they be lay or clerical. But, doubtless, many a clergyman's heart must oft-times sink within him when he finds so many of his efforts crowned with disappointment, and laymen who have devoted months and years to the work of charity are sometimes seen to flag at last, and to wax comparatively harsh and bitter in their judgments : but let us not trust in the arm of flesh, or look for a speedy and visible result to our labours. Many a rough heart may be secretly touched where we least suspect it. We have witnessed instances in which a clergyman visited regularly for months and months, apparently with little or no success, in a certain district of his parish ; scarcely any of those who were visited came to God's house ; they received relief in the shape of money and of tickets, and yet in some cases they were barely civil, if even that ; and yet, long after he had left that parish and that neighbourhood, when some

of the most hardened, to all outward seeming, were visited with sickness, they spoke with strong affection of that very clergyman, and declared that an impression had been wrought on their hearts by his frequent visits, and that they had learnt, after all, to know that the Church was their only friend in time of need. So was it in this instance, and so will it almost always be. One thing, however, is obvious, that services ought to be provided at those hours when the poor are best able to attend; and that even if all the best seats be appropriated, as is doubtless in most cases unavoidable, and perhaps even desirable, for the eleven and three o'clock services, they should be thrown open to all comers at a later hour. We have seen this carried out in a parish church in a large provincial town, and work most satisfactorily, the labouring classes availing themselves, to a great extent, of this opportunity of joining in public worship, and hearing the word of God with ease and comfort to themselves; and, under this needful restriction, with this special evening service at least reserved for all comers (a morning one might perhaps follow in course of time, though there are great practical difficulties in the way,—difficulties, however, which, we believe, are surmounted at Kensington, and in some other parish churches), it appears to us, we confess, that the pew-system scarcely deserves the load of reprobation which has been cast upon it, and that it may even be retained in most instances with great advantage. For assuredly there is a comfort and delight in returning to the old family seat in the quiet church where generations perhaps have knelt and prayed; and even in the newest London chapel there is a peculiar pleasure in kneeling side by side with those we love; the father of a family naturally desires to be seated with his children: it would be exceedingly disagreeable for a large party to have to seek for places every time they entered their own church. Where worship is so individual, as it is for the more part in Roman Catholic places of worship, such an arrangement may appear feasible, but ours is Common Prayer, which lasts a certain given time, and which seems almost to require that families should have their recognized seats and places.

It will be seen that we do not advocate the formal separation of the sexes: indeed this seems to us inconsistent with the true theory of common prayer or of public religious worship; though here and there, from peculiar circumstances, or where old custom has sanctioned it, it may not be inexpedient. We do not hold that the worshipper is to leave the man behind on the threshold of the house of God; that men, that is, are *not* to bring their business cares, their troubles and anxieties of all kinds, (as we hear it sometimes contended,) into the presence of their Maker;

that the father is to cease to be the father, or the child the child. Far from all this, we contend that every pure desire should be confided to our all-merciful Creator; that those aims and endeavours which form the chief occupation of our daily lives should not be forgotten in the sanctuary, but sanctified by prayer and praise. Therefore would we see the husband and the wife kneel side by side, the brother and the sister, the mother and the son; nay, we are not to be persuaded that even affianced lovers, on whose vows Heaven smiles benignantly, should separate from one another, or endeavour to forget their mutual tenderness within God's house. Earthly joys and sorrows are not to be laid aside, only to be resumed when we leave that sacred dwelling, as though earth and heaven were necessarily inimical to one another; rather are these flowers of earth, however bright and beautiful, to be laid before the altar and steeped in the radiance which flows from heaven.

We have seen too the great practical evils of the separation we object to; the poor, more especially, when they have not been accustomed to this practice, are sorely offended by it; the working man delights to sit by his wife; frequently he cannot find the places in his Prayer-Book for himself, and needs her assistance, and, in any case, he does not like the formality of being marshalled to a particular part of the church away from *her* side, who has, perhaps, with some difficulty persuaded him to accompany her thither (for we must look at things as they are); he shrinks instinctively from what he feels to be an unnatural and un-English practice, alien to all our habits of thought, and possibly harbouring some popish tendencies beneath it; for of every thing which they suspect to have any tendency to Popery our English working classes have no little dread. With many, alas! the strongest, if not the only religious feeling seems to be an abhorrence of Romanism, and still greater of Romanising! We have known instances of working people who never entered a place of worship who were yet nervously sensitive on the subject of Popery, and have earnestly besought their clergyman to look after certain children, respecting whom they entertained suspicions that their parents, for the sake of gain, were ready to send them to some Roman Catholic school. But, to return from this digression, we must on every score object to the separation of the sexes in places of worship, and trust that it will not be carried out in any new churches, not even in those which are entirely *free*, and built for the especial service of the poor, and that where this practice has been introduced it may be gradually relinquished without parade. The poor do not like it, and its effect will always be, we fear, to keep the great majority of the *men* of the

working classes total strangers to the service of the sanctuary. They do not like the conspicuousness of their position, seated on that side of the church which is by far the more thinly occupied ; for women will always be found to attend our churches in a larger proportion than men ; though it should be remembered, on the other hand, that there are many military chapels, and such churches as that of the Temple, where the great bulk of the congregation is necessarily male. So it is, however, that separation works ill, and is besides, in our opinion, indefensible in principle, and inconsistent with the theory and animus of the English Church, selfish, unsocial, and ascetic in its bearings.

If, therefore, the pew-system, by which we mean the appropriation of seats, without any reference to the advisability of leaving them entirely open in appearance, or dividing them by small doors, be adhered to (and that it will be, as a matter of fact, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, there cannot be a doubt, because common sense and all our habits of thought and feeling demand it), it ought, we think, to be understood and acknowledged, that the holding of a pew can give a right only to two services, the chief one in the morning at eleven, and that in the afternoon at three ; so as to render it possible for the clergyman to have an evening service for the working classes, for all indeed, throwing open all the seats or pews to the first comers. Of course in many instances grave objections would be raised on the score of probable injury to books, and cushions, and kneeling-stools ; but all these objections, by aid of a little patience and love on the part of the parish priest, may, we should hope, be subdued. Boxes can be easily erected with locks and keys for the reception of books, cushions can without much difficulty be stowed away, if that be held desirable by pew-holders, in drawers provided for that purpose under their seats, and kneeling-stools can be removed to the vestry, for the nonce, so as to be out of harm's way. It is true that some people may possibly prefer the evening to the afternoon service, where they have been accustomed to the former all their lives, but by coming early enough they will probably still be able to secure their own, or at all events good places ; and if not, are we not absolutely called on by imperative circumstances to make sacrifices, great sacrifices even, for the sake of our poorer brethren, if needful ? Of course we do not wish or expect to see evening congregations consisting exclusively of the labouring classes ; a mixture is always very preferable : only seat-holders would predominate in the morning and afternoon, and the poor, we should hope, in the evening. And does it not behove every parish priest seriously to consider, more especially in our cities, whether he is not called upon to provide one

entirely free service on the Sunday, at which no distinctions of rank or dignity should be observed, and the best seats be thrown freely open to the first comers? Whilst we go on building and endowing new churches day by day, (and Heaven forbid that we should throw any obstacle in the way of this good work!) would it not be well if we made sure that we had done what we could, and provided as much church accommodation as was possible, in our present houses of God? Where there is not, at all events, one entirely free service on the Sunday for prayers and sermon, this cannot be said to be accomplished! We do most earnestly urge this matter on the attention of both clergy and laity, as well as on the right reverend fathers in God the bishops of our Church, whose advice and encouragement in the carrying out of such free services would be certain to ensure their all but universal adoption, removing the principal difficulties that might otherwise arise. But the clergy are plainly justified in acting in this matter even without any directions from a higher quarter, for they are responsible for all the souls of their flocks, and are bound, we should say, not to rest till they have rendered it at least possible for the working classes generally to attend their ministrations; and that without feeling that they are marshalled to inferior seats, or treated in any way as intruders.

But, do what the clergy will, doubtless their difficulties will still remain enormous in inducing large masses of the working classes to take part in any religious services whatsoever! at least in London and our large towns. And, be it remembered, as some palliation of the unwillingness of these people to attend, not only that their social circumstances are as wretched as we have described them, that they are constantly without decent clothing, and have given way to evil habits, more especially with reference to drinking, as a consequence of their loss of self-respect; but further, that during the course of several generations they have been suffered to remain absent from our churches, almost without any effort to reclaim them; there have been no services at hours when they *could* attend; our parish churches have not only been filled with pews, but those pews have been treated as private property at all hours and for all services; as children indeed, a certain fraction of every generation have been taught in our parish schools and taken in a body to our church galleries; and were it not for the lingering effects of this, we presume that the masses we allude to would be heathens altogether. Under these circumstances, then, we cannot expect the poor to change their mode of living in a day; they have learnt, hundreds of thousands, we may say, millions have learnt, to pass their Sundays in a state of dull indifference, not dressing till one or two in the day,

and then lolling about on their beds for the greater part of the remainder of it, or lounging at the corners of the street, or smoking listlessly, or seated in one corner of their chambers, as we have often seen them, staring vacantly before them, or gossiping idly with their neighbours: since their childhood it may be that they have never been interfered with in these habits; they have never been urged to attend a place of worship; or if so, by way of reprimand and with some show of severity, when relief was administered to them in the winter. The Church has not seemed their home; the free seats have never appeared inviting to them; if on any occasion they have wandered in, the prayers have seemed strange and long, the sermon has too probably been unintelligible; the act of attendance at religious worship has appeared to them, in fine, something that pertained rather to the rich than to the poor; something respectable and aristocratic, and altogether *proper*, that was at variance with their miserable poverty and still more wretched way of living; and so, as we have said, they did not feel at home, and returned not again. We are confident that there are tens of thousands of families of working people in London, nominally Christians and members of the Church of England, who would feel offended with any body who called them dissenters or unbelievers, and whose children probably go to school and to church up to the age of thirteen or fourteen, who have not entered any place of worship for many years, who pass Sunday after Sunday in the same dull and listless manner, and who will not be persuaded in an hour or a day to frequent the house of God, even if its doors be constantly thrown open, and its best seats provided for them. Where habits of listlessness have once been formed, it is difficult indeed to break through them. But the only chance lies, that is plain, in the influence of parochial visitation, and so do we find ourselves brought back once more to what should be the principal theme of this unavoidably rambling disquisition.

Though we have declared very positively against that makeshift system which would substitute the attention of lay parochial visitors to the poor for the regular calls of the parish clergy, yet we must not be understood to question the great importance of the assistance of the laity, and the desirability, in all large town and city parishes at least, of parcelling each parish out into so many streets, or given number of houses, each to be attended to by its own special lay visitor: we only contend that it is still essential that the clergy should themselves continue to visit, regularly, and, if possible, for a certain number of hours daily, two, or three, or four, as the case may be; not in any one given district only, but throughout their parish; (save where it may be ad-

visable to effect a clerical division of labour also, for the better discharge of the whole;) so as to identify themselves with the wants and wishes of the working classes, and become their personal friends and counsellors.

Still, we repeat, we are seriously of opinion that the clergy should not labour unassisted: in large town parishes it would be quite impossible for them to discharge their work efficiently without aid. We believe that the District Visiting system is already carried out in a very efficient manner in many of the larger London parishes, as well as in our other towns and cities, thanks, as far as the metropolis is concerned, in no small measure, to that most valuable "Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Association," the Reports of which, for the last two years, lie before us, and contain many most emphatic clerical testimonies to the value of this definite and systematic lay-assistance. Every thing which brings the clergy and laity of the so-called respectable classes into close working combination is, of course, valuable for its own sake; men, and women, too, naturally take a much deeper interest in works to which they devote their energies. And, besides this, the clergy cannot do a third part of the district visiting work, that should be done. But having acknowledged this, and gladly borne our tribute to the real and pains-taking labours of so many devoted members of the laity, of either sex, we must insist with more urgency than ever, that their visits cannot be received as a *substitute* for those of the clergy; that the latter must not shut themselves up in their studies, and pass their days and nights in concocting learned sermons, but put their own shoulders to the wheel, and go amongst the poor.

No doubt, the task of visiting must often be a painful one; so many noisome stenchcs are there to encounter, so many lamentable sounds and sights, so much hopeless indifference to religion, so much dirt and misery of every kind. But this work, like every other honest and hearty one, only in a higher degree perhaps than any other conceivable earthly task, has its many and great rewards. Let the reader accompany us then, in fancy, on a clerical tour of this nature through some of the bye-streets and back lanes of our vast metropolis; and we think we shall be able to demonstrate that compensations are rarely wanting to the labourer for his toil.

On proceeding to our field of labour, we thread some narrow and dirty streets, perhaps, with frequent and intricate windings, and issue upon a rather small and noisome bye-street, with some thirty houses on either side of it, lying within a bowshot of the noisiest thoroughfares on earth, but off the direct line of passage or traffic, and so comparatively isolated: yet quiet does not pre-

vail. Every here and there dirty little ragamuffins, boys and girls perhaps scarcely distinguishable, are playing with mud and mire, or enjoying a game of leap-frog, or of shuttle-cocks, in the middle of the street,—whooping and hallooing to the utmost of their by no means limited abilities. The multitude of children, by-the-bye, who come to life, and continue in life, in such districts as these, is scarcely to be credited by those who do not make themselves acquainted with the fact. There are few families that have not six or seven or eight children. But, to resume, very possibly also some of the endless varieties of London street vendors are bawling their commodities down the row, and groups of women are gossiping at several of the house doors. The houses are tolerably high, and have once been respectable: they are now usually tenanted by seven or eight families each, or say, at an average, some fifty persons. Many of these houses have small shops below, grocers', pawnbrokers', &c. The clergyman, who intends to devote the next two or three hours to visiting for the first time, from room to room, in a certain number of these houses, enters one of the shops, and salutes the master or mistress behind the counter, courteously wishing them good day. Courteousness, we take leave to repeat, is most essential in all clerical dealings, whether with the middle or the lower classes residing in our larger towns and cities. The clergyman introduces himself in the present instance as soon as possible by name, stating that his immediate purpose is to make acquaintance with his parishioners; and then, fearful of wounding the susceptibilities of the small shopkeeper, who is usually a most *touchy* individual, by making special inquiries as to his wife or children, the attendance at school of the latter, or their religious habits, lest he should be supposed to wish to exert an unrecognized authority, he proceeds to say, after one or two general observations as to the state of the neighbourhood, and the length of residence of the tradesman and his family in the district, "Probably you, sir, are the householder; or, if not, I dare say you can, at all events, give me the names of the other lodgers in this house, and tell me whether they have many children." The shopkeeper in all probability gives the names, or at least the greater part of them, which the clergyman notes in his little pocket-book, somewhat after this fashion, "Jones, Front Kitchen—Phillips, Back—Wilson, First Floor Front—Clements, Back," &c.; and thus armed, after a few more civilities, just mentioning perhaps in a somewhat careless way the hours of service at the church, and the pleasure he would have in seeing Mr. — and his family there—(the majority of this order of *small* shopkeepers, we must remark in passing, go no where, Sunday being too probably their

busiest day, that is, in London ; those, who are more *serious*, sit under some dissenting minister ; of course there are exceptions)—he proceeds on his appointed journey, to devote the next half hour, it may be, to the making acquaintance with seven or eight new families of the working classes in the house.

A certain amount of moral courage is doubtless requisite in such an undertaking ; and desirable, we should say, is a flexibility of mind and disposition, a readiness for all comers. At least, these qualities are useful, though not indispensable ; for it is probable that sincere and earnest piety, and true love of the brethren, will more than supply their absence. The clergyman, however, *must* not be one who is easily daunted or repelled, for he is certain to meet with some rebuffs in the course of his peregrinations. Possibly on this very occasion he may enter a room, in the first instance, where he finds two or three men working together, at shoemaking, or some such employment, who will not remove their hats from their heads, or rise from their seats to greet him when he enters. Of such rudeness he must of course take no notice whatsoever ; nay, not even pretend to remark it ; but advance unconcernedly, saying, “ Mr. Watkins, I believe ! ” having taken care to refer, before opening the door, to the names on his list : (it is a great point to know the name ; it seems to give you some standing as an acquaintance, and nobody, however poor and solitary, is ever surprised at being known :) probably a surly “ Yes, sir,” will be grunted forth by way of reply ; or, perhaps, “ I’m Mr. Watkins : what may you want with him ? ” “ Merely to make your acquaintance, as Mr. —, the clergyman of this district,” is of course the natural reply ; “ I hope trade is pretty flourishing.” This, if said in a cheerful and friendly tone, is well-nigh certain to affect Watkins’ manners for the better. “ Take a chair, sir,” he says. The clergyman does so, and enters on a conversation, usually discussing the present prospects of business, the amount of wages, and so forth. After five minutes of this chat the pastor feels that he can ask without abruptness after the wife and children, and what schools are frequented by the latter, and mentions perhaps the parish school. A directly religious conversation is not, we think, usually to be recommended, unless some opening present itself. Sometimes such an opening may be made in a half-jocular way by one of the men visited : “ So you’re Mr. — : we don’t trouble church much in our business.” “ Ah, don’t you ? The more’s the pity. I do not think your life can be so happy in this world as not to *need* the comfort of religion.” Thus opened, a conversation may of course prove useful. Generally, a kind and lenient tone is to be recommended ; it seems useless to express horror at a

way of "living without God in the world," which is almost universal round about you; nor is it desirable to commence by quoting many Scripture texts, since it is too possible that the man you speak to may be disposed to question the authority of God's word, and you lay yourself open to the suspicion of cant. The essential is of course to place yourself, as far as you can, in the situation of those to whom you speak, and employ such arguments as they are likely to understand, taking care to show that you feel with them, all the while, and do not judge them too severely. To attempt to enter into further details of such a conversation would be tedious: we may say, however, that we have known instances in which the clergyman has been yet more surlily received than this by working men, and yet has parted from them, after a quarter of an hour, on the very best of terms, they insisting on shaking hands once, or even twice, with him, and manifestly feeling more kindly towards the clergy generally than they did before he entered their chamber.

We trust that our clerical readers will all agree with us that even one such result as this, small as it may seem, would be a compensation for two or three hours of house-visiting labour: something, the visitor will feel, has been done, however small, to fill up the chasm betwixt rich and poor; something to convince the working man that he is not regarded as a Pariah by his social superiors, and that a clergyman is not necessarily a tyrant or a humbug, who only lives to preach fine sermons to great people, and take as much money as he can get.

In the same house will possibly be found in the front kitchen a widow, with three or four children, one an errand-boy, the others dirty little imps, cowering in the corners or pressing to the windows with their backs turned to you when you come in; yet not in the least shy—only savage; with a keen look about the eyes and brow, and an appearance of unnatural sharpness for their years. The aspect of the majority of the London children is really painful, it is so "old world" cunning, and wise, and usually bold and insolent also. They seem, in fact, to look on all strangers as natural enemies. Still, even *they* are to be gained, and sooner than you may look for. Kind words and friendly glances, and the show of some little sympathy with their amusements, will soon relax the sharp lines in those young features, and call forth a responsive smile. They are not accustomed to much real kindness: their parents are usually too fond, and indulgent to the last degree, but carelessly so; they do not look after the children, or take any great notice of them, but leave them to themselves, and when they do correct them, they almost always do so in a passion, with hard cuffs, and the addition of

some few oaths and blasphemous epithets. At the parish school, inestimable as its labours are, severity is generally found requisite to secure order; and pupil teachers, more especially, who teach the great majority, not being much elevated above their pupils in point of years or stature, are almost forced to adopt a tone of high and stern authority in order to maintain their posts. Consequently, these children of the poor have met with but little kindness *in word*; they have never been spoken to affably in hours of play, and, in the first instance, a kind question and a friendly smile are apt to appear strange novelties to them, and are met only by a stare. But we have seen many instances in which these little savages were gradually improved, both in looks and manners, in no small measure owing, we believe, to clerical influence. We have heard it remarked even that the expression of the children's faces had quite changed, in a neighbourhood where a clergyman, who was fond of children, and took notice of them, had been working for some time. But, to resume, the widow and her children are visited on this occasion, and the widow, who has a sad tale of suffering to relate, probably receives a shilling or two, and promises to send the younger children to school more regularly than she has done, and to induce the errand-boy to go to church with her next Sunday evening, if she can. As for morning church it is too commonly out of the question: even very decent working people, regular church-goers in the evening, rarely think it possible, we find, to be dressed in time for the morning service, though they do manage with some difficulty to dress their children and send them off to Sunday school, an hour later perhaps than they ought to arrive.

One or two rooms in this same house will very probably be tenanted by Irish Roman Catholics, with whom the clergyman will do well to keep on friendly terms. Indeed, he must not think of confining his charity to attendants at his church, in town and city districts. To do so, would not only be a direct bounty on hypocrisy, lowering religion inexpressibly in the eyes of those who receive relief, and occasioning a sickening amount of cant and lying, but it would defeat its own end, and keep away from church the more honest and independent, who would be indignant at any thing approaching to a bargain of this nature. Nor can we advise the clergy to enter into controversy with Roman Catholics, or dissenters of any kind, unless they are in a measure driven to it. In the present state of the masses, our first feeling must be, that *any* religion is far better than none at all. If a clergyman really finds that the family he is visiting are regular attendants at a place of worship, he has, in so far, reason to rejoice; and he will do well to say, in most instances at least, "Of course, I would rather see

you come to my church, and belong to that Church which I believe to be the true one, which our Blessed Lord Himself founded, and which is governed just as the Apostles ordered it to be governed; but if you love your Saviour, that is the one essential; and God may make allowance for errors that do not proceed from pride, or temper, or vanity." We should say, Do not let it be supposed that you consider it immaterial what Church a man belongs to: far from it; let people know that there is in your judgment a right and a wrong; but rest satisfied with this, and do not engage yourselves in deliberate efforts to make converts from one form of Christianity to another, as long as there is such a mass of heathenism and of total indifference to religion round about you.

Perhaps this may be considered latitudinarian language, but assuredly we are no latitudinarians. We do not mean to say that a parish priest should shrink from religious argument; and, assuredly, if he visit a sick papist, he should not fail to tell him to fix his faith on his Lord and Saviour, the everlasting Son of God, the infinitely compassionate Man, Christ Jesus, and rest satisfied with the contemplation of no Virgin, and no Saint; with nothing short of the cross of Calvary, and Him that hung thereon. But, we think, in most instances, it is better to place a higher truth, which must be acknowledged, before the mind, and persuade the heart to realize it, than directly to combat a religious error, which has been cherished from childhood upward, and cannot, perhaps, be hastily removed without tearing up with it a vast amount of good and reverential feeling. Thus, we would not endeavour to persuade the Protestant dissenter that he had never received the Lord's Supper, or that the ministers whom he so highly honoured, were, strictly speaking, no ministers at all. Leaving such questions on one side, we would doubtless set before him the fact that, there should, of right, be only one Church, one Faith, and one Baptism; but then we would preach Christ crucified to his soul, taking care to guard this central truth from misconstruction, and to render manifest that the love of Christ must be rightly apprehended by the sinner, if His death is to benefit that sinner's soul. We should say, in fine, though ours may be considered cold and tame advice, Go with the members of other communions as far as you can go consistently with the truth: do not conceal from them that you think them wrong, wherever they differ from the Church; but, at the same time, do not allow them to imagine that you consign every body to reprobation who does not receive the whole truth and is not in full possession of Church-membership: dwell rather on those blessed truths, which you both hold in common, and lead their spirits to the cross of their and your Redeemer.

But this, too, is a digression : we were speaking of ordinary district-, rather than of sick-visiting ; only that the two are naturally connected ; because visiting from room to room is sure to bring you into contact with a certain number of sick persons, of whom you would not otherwise have made the acquaintance ; some, as we have said, Roman Catholics ; and some few, dissenters, (but very few among the really poor,) many nominal Church people ; and some, who do not even profess to belong to any communion whatsoever.

Without entering more into details than it is possible for us to do, we find that we could scarcely carry out our first intention of following a morning's wanderings, or of even describing all the various "*ménages*" of one single house in such a district. We must content ourselves with instancing some few particular cases, which have fallen under our own notice individually in the course of visiting, and have convinced us of the desirableness of persisting in this practice.

We have come on many families who were starving, or all but starving, whom a little temporary relief has extricated from the greater part of their difficulties ; but the circumstances were scarcely of sufficient moment to warrant special enumeration.

To descend to *particulars*, however. We have fallen in, thus, with a poor young woman, a widow, the daughter of a highly respectable shopkeeper, left in the most destitute circumstances, with three young children. Being rather handsome, of course, the danger of her situation was very great. The children were starving before her eyes ; proposals of a vile nature were made to her, by one who promised to help her to get the two elder out in the world ; in a weak hour she yielded. Of course, the seducer soon departed, taking care to leave no trace of his whereabouts, and breaking all his promises. When we first called on this poor creature, a little child had just been born into the world, and born blind, the fruit of this intrigue. The mother was in a state bordering on despair ; cast off by all her friends and relatives, and almost utterly destitute. In the same house lived another woman, of very bad character. She had formed an acquaintance with this woman, and the only possible end could be foreseen. It was horrible. But, by God's grace, who sent the helper at the right hour, with a little judicious money-aid, but, above all, by sympathy, and kindness, and encouragement, this wanderer was reclaimed, or seems to have been altogether reclaimed ; and, despite of cruel treatment subsequently, on the part of her kinsfolk, and many great privations, she has ever since persisted in a course of strict propriety ; and, it is to be hoped, may yet redeem herself from her sunk condition even in this life,

and become a useful member of society. Such a case as this is indeed consolatory to a clergyman. What parish priest would not join in the Apostle's exclamation,—“I have no greater joy than to hear, ‘or see,’ that my children walk in truth?”

Again, quite casually, we have entered a small chamber, where a child, a boy of some ten years of age, lay dying in his narrow bed. He had been asking for a clergyman all the night; yet too probably a clergyman would not have been fetched in time, had he not thus opportunely made his appearance. This boy had been at the parish school for the last two or three years; but he had lived in one of the very worst parts of London, where drinking, swearing, and fighting were the ordinary occupations of the inhabitants, close to a small cattle-market, which the windows of his chambers overlooked. He had lost his father early; and his mother was a hard-working, but thoroughly irreligious woman; and yet, marvellous to relate, this child was a simple-hearted, innocent, lowly saint of God. He clasped the clergyman's hand in his, and said, “O *do* read, sir! *do*, pray!” “What shall I read to you?” “About our blessed Lord.” “Do you remember Him, then?” “O yes; and how He died for me!” And then he repeated one or two simple texts, but without the slightest admixture of formalism or affectation; nothing that the veriest scoffer could have fancied cant. The mother afterwards said that this boy of hers had always been pious; always fond of play and merriment, too; yet, when his playmates used bad words, he would not *say* any thing, indeed, but always went away from them. When she was tired at night she would often forget her prayers, she said, and fling herself down on the bed quite worn out; but then he would wake up anxiously, and say, “Oh, mother, mother, you haven't prayed to God to-night!” and not let her rest till she rose up and did so. What a privilege did we not feel it to kneel by the bed-side, and receive almost the parting blessing of such a secret child of God as this, kept in the midst of a worse fire than the burning fiery furnace of Babylon, from the influence of spiritual wickedness, by the unseen presence of the Son of God! Yet this privilege also was only gained in consequence of parochial visitation from room to room.

Beautiful, most beautiful is it, we cannot refrain from observing, to see such a living record as this of the power of Christianity in the very centre of a mass of carelessness, and blasphemy, and sin! Wonderful to think that the Protecting Arm should always have been upheld above the head of this young child! Surely, the Lord dwells, indeed, about and around his own people, “even as the mountains stand about Jerusalem.”

We cannot promise our readers that they will often meet with such a case as this ; and yet we trust and believe that it is not singular. We know other boys and girls, God be praised for it ! who seem to combine the glad spirit of childhood with the love of God, and of their Saviour ; who draw no long faces when they see others playing, but are themselves, perhaps, the loudest and the merriest of the joyful party, and yet practise daily self-examination, and “ keep a conscience pure towards God and man.” And it strikes us, though we may be prejudiced in the matter, that it is the peculiar prerogative of the English Church to rear such children as these, where her energies are developed. Protestant dissent either neglects childhood altogether, or is apt to make it sullen, and stunt its natural growth ; its “ pious children ” are not at all delightful to us, we must confess ; they are so alarmingly conscious of their own goodness, and so certain that the whole world lies in wickedness beside themselves. And again Romanism too often seems to make children formalists, and to check their intellectual growth : it does not engender hypocrisy, we should say ; but rather a strange mixture of levity, and hyperbolical and superstitious devotion, which has a tendency to wear the heart away, while it weakens the moral character.

But to return to our illustrations of the advantages attendant on clerical district-visiting, one more special case, and we have done ; though special cases, after all, cannot prove much ; for it is the general effect of this practice in the promotion of a spirit of kindness between rich and poor, and a feeling of mutual trust and confidence betwixt a pastor and his people, which must of course be considered its principal recommendation. Still generalities will never touch the heart, and do not make their due impression, even upon the intellect. And, therefore, choosing one more out of many instances, for no particular reason, but because it happens to occur first to us, we shall specify the case of a poor sick Frenchman, once a cook in high repute, making his hundreds, and driving a curricule, now reduced, in the last stage of a lingering consumption, to a state of the most extreme poverty, living in a miserable back room, with a wife and one boy, and supported almost entirely by the work of the former. This man had been nurtured and educated as a Romanist, being a native of Provence, and owning the ancient language of the Troubadours, the *langue d’Oc*. In London he had fallen, by his own account, into irreligious ways and practices ; in fact, being a reflecting man, he had become convinced of the absurdity of popish legends generally, and of the falsity of the working-system of that Church ; and so, like tens of thousands of others

in the like predicament, he had leapt to the conclusion that religion was altogether a fiction, and a sham. Discovering, though with some difficulty, his immediate physical needs, (*he* would say nothing on the subject, and the truth was only learnt by questioning his wife,) the clergyman relieved them to the best of his ability, and discoursed with the poor sufferer, then in no immediate danger, on various general subjects, saying little about religion; for he supposed him to be a Roman Catholic, and was careful not to wound his Gascon pride, or, in other words, his somewhat excessive "*amour propre*." After two or three friendly visits of this nature, religious themes were touched on rather more closely, but still with no direct *doctrinal* teaching; and permission was asked to offer up a prayer by his bed-side for the relief of his pains. The poor man had not appeared at all devotionally or religiously affected; but, how little can we judge from outward appearances! It came out, afterwards, that all this time he was secretly desirous that religious subjects should be entered on; nay, the first religious impressions he had entertained for many years, had been now awakened within his breast; and a conviction was growing and deepening there, that religion was a reality, and that a priest was not necessarily a pretender or a Pharisee. And some few evenings afterwards, believing himself to be near his end, (though he did not die for some months later,) the scoffer of so many years sent for the Anglican priest, who had thus visited him in his affliction, and begged to know whether he might not enjoy the privilege of Holy Communion once again. He did so; and he died subsequently, as we hope and believe, in the enjoyment of a living faith. Now this poor man, it is certain, would never have sent for a clergyman; and it is probable that if any lay-visitor had found him, he would have made little of such a case; (for to a layman this penitent would not have spoken;) and he, supposing the man to be a Roman Catholic, would scarcely have thought of sending the clergyman on a seemingly fruitless errand. This poor fellow needed to be convinced by experience that priests can think of something beyond their formal duties; that they are not only ready and willing to go through certain religious ceremonies, but that they also take a practical interest in the well-being of their poor and sick parishioners, and will not consent to sink the man in the clergyman.

On a retrospection, we are disposed to fear that we have very imperfectly illustrated our thesis; but the intention must stand for the deed; it is difficult to convey a vivid perception of the benefits derived from such intercourse to any third party.

It will be seen, however, from the cases we have cited, as well

as from the general tenor of our remarks, that we almost always lean to the side of leniency, and think the poor can scarcely be dealt with too favourably and mildly. It may be said that imposition and vice are likely to be thus encouraged; but, on the whole, our experience points to a contrary conclusion. Let the clergyman only take heed, we should say, never to relieve, without *visiting*, either the sick or the poor, and judging from the evidence of his own eyes upon the spot; and *then* he can scarcely be very much deceived. This should be a positive rule, always religiously adhered to, excepting in the case of those who are already well and favourably known; and no representation of pressing misery, on occasions when it is impossible to attend to it for some few hours, should, in our judgment, extract a single penny. If the sufferers have waited days already, as you will often hear, then they must wait another day, if need be. Once allow yourself, we should say, to break through this salutary rule, and in the first case you will open a door to deception and fraud of all kinds; in the next, you will be encouraging a habit of idleness in yourself; if you once trust to chance, you will be tempted to do so a second time, and a third, and then you will, in all probability, bring so many applicants upon you, that you will really be unable to attend to them at their houses, and may consequently be induced to abandon the attempt altogether. On the other hand, the firm adherence to the rule of not giving a farthing without calling on the applicant at his or her own dwelling (it is almost always the woman who comes to ask assistance), is likely to diminish the number of petitioners; none will apply, save those who do actually reside in the parish, and only the really indigent among these. But, we repeat, mercy is to be preferred to justice, in the dealing with our unfortunate working classes. Alas! much as there is of moral wickedness and vice, there is perhaps still more of physical wretchedness, the former being usually, in our judgment, engendered by the latter.

We fear that we have still given no distinct notion of the habits and ways of living of our London poor, which are too similar, as we know from experience, to those of the working classes of other cities, save that the Londoners are usually more conversible, more conversant with the ways and manners of the world, and more utterly indifferent to religion.

Let us, therefore, before this rambling article is drawn to a close, take a sweeping survey of the inhabitants of a small court in the centre of a very populous neighbourhood, and in the immediate proximity of a church with daily services, and entirely open sittings. The clergyman is on a friendly footing with all the families we shall mention, relieving their wants from time to

time pretty liberally, and visiting rather frequently at their houses ; and yet the great majority of them never enter a church, or any other place of worship : and though there is nothing remarkable or peculiarly interesting in the cases we shall mention, this enhances their value in one respect, because they are such average specimens of their respective classes. The family at the corner, to proceed in order, with two grown-up daughters, a son old enough to earn his living, and two or three younger children, are in tolerable circumstances ; the father is a wheelwright, and earns from twenty to twenty-five shillings a week ; the mother goes out working in the summer, and altogether they must realize a very comfortable sum. Wonderful to relate ! they have two rooms to live in instead of one ; but then they frequently take in lodgers, and usually young men, which occasions scandal to be whispered by the neighbours, and something more than whispered, whenever there is a row in the court, though the young women seem respectable. These people never enter a place of worship, and have not done so for years. The clergyman has asked them repeatedly if they have not been to hear him yet, and has ventured on some friendly exhortations ; but they always make some frivolous excuse, and talk as if they were in the habit of going, and should be likely to go next Sunday ! They seem industrious, and live happily enough, to all appearance, among themselves, though they are apt to quarrel with their neighbours. Despite their melancholy religious indifference, they appear to have some affection, or, at all events, a very kindly feeling for the clergyman ; so it is *hoped* things may mend in time. And so much must be proffered by way of palliation for their sin : they live in a part of London, and have done so for the last twenty years, in which, throughout nearly all that time, there was only one church for just 20,000 people, and that church almost entirely occupied with pews. There was, *then*, no church-accommodation for the masses, and no attempt at it, and so those masses have learnt from long habit to do without church at all ! The children have gone, notwithstanding all this, one after the other to the parish school, and consequently to church also ; and the elder branches of the family would not like to attend the services at a dissenting chapel.

In the next house, Anglo-Irish people live below, a young shoemaker and his pretty little wife with several children, both of them good tempered and fair spoken ; they attend certain so-called London Mission services, occasionally, for half an hour on the Sunday afternoon, these services being conducted by laymen, who are either extreme Calvinists yet nominal Churchmen, or dissenters. We may be allowed to mention here, in passing, that these London City Mission-men, with the best intentions doubt-

less, do on the whole harm as well as good. They are generally self-educated, and very narrow-minded people, who acknowledge no religion apart from a certain "Shibboleth" of their own, and encourage those who listen to them (a small minority) to be as intolerant and uncharitable as themselves. They not only intrude in parishes without the knowledge or consent of the parochial clergy, visiting from house to house, as though they there held a special charge—(very frequently, notwithstanding their pretensions, they are received roughly, and shown the door,)—but they also imagine it to be their duty to deliver their testimony against the parish-church and parish-priest, if both do not exactly come up to their religious notions; and we have known instances in which they have succeeded in disquieting the consciences and temporarily shaking the faith of communicants among the poor, pouring out a flood of turgid rant and misapplied Scripture, in order to convince them that because they were not conscious of any extraordinary change in their feelings and deportment at some one period of their lives, they must be in a state of Egyptian bondage and altogether castaways. Some of these men possess no little cleverness, and, apart from their bigotry and narrow-mindedness, appear to be endowed with an earnest desire to advance the interests of the Gospel and to help their brethren. The Reports of their proceedings which lie before us possess no little interest, though they are marred by unhappy attacks on clergymen and their parochial services. Still, setting all other considerations on one side, these are not the men to regenerate the working classes, or to raise them above their present condition. They make, we fear, many scoffers unintentionally, and assuredly they are promoting, whether consciously or not, a spirit of discontent with almost all our institutions in Church and State. The poor man, thanks to them, is often led to confound religion and cant. Those, when they do influence at all for good, they generally carry to the meeting-house. But, we need *gentlemen* to visit the poor, and to become their friends and counsellors; gentlemen, who will treat them with becoming delicacy, and who, having received a liberal education have also enlarged minds, and are able to make allowance for the errors and short-comings of their poorer brethren, and address themselves to their peculiar cases. With the very best intentions, neither City-Mission-men¹ nor dissenting ministers, nor popish priests and monks, can accomplish that work of renovation and reform, which if it be not effected by the earnest efforts of our Anglican clergy, will, we are firmly persuaded, never be wrought at all. And then, not to dwell on

¹ The Church of England "Scripture Readers' Society," is, we trust, doing much good.

the fearful spiritual consequences of such a failure, great, it is too manifest, must be our social downfall.

But to return, what first induced this Anglo-Irish couple to attend these said prayer-meetings, it seems difficult to conjecture; possibly, curiosity; they do not often go to *these*, but they rarely, if ever, enter church.—Upstairs, in the same dwelling resides a family, consisting of father, mother, three sons and a daughter, the youngest son fourteen years of age. They are specimens of a numerous class. They earn good wages, but live in a constant state of dirt and discomfort; both father and mother drink, and their quarrels in their cups are fearful, and seem likely to end fatally some day; *they* also never enter church, though they are on good terms with the clergyman, and take great credit to themselves for being no hypocrites! When they are in liquor, both father and mother employ the most fearful oaths, and then complain that the children are not obedient and dutiful: a worse regulated household, in fine, it seems difficult to conceive; and yet *their* children also have all attended the parish schools, and the youngest boy, a cripple who halts on crutches, does so still. Gin is the fountain of misery and sin in this instance, and has been so for very many years. No exhortation can mend matters. Nothing but the constraining grace of God can work a reformation here, and this seems scarcely to be hoped, yet ever prayed, for.—In the next house lives a woman of fifty who has married a young man of twenty-five; she supports him, and reproaches him with the fact; he drinks, and treats her infamously, keeping her two boys, by her former husband, to whom she is strongly attached, in a state of terror for their lives. She goes to church sometimes on Sunday evenings, much against her husband's will, who always abuses her soundly for it; as for him, he is destroying himself, body and soul, by drink; the boys are industrious, well-behaved, and fond of going to Sunday school and church.—Above them lives an Irish Roman Catholic family, favourable specimens of their class, regular chapel-goers, and good-humoured, and happy in the main. The clergyman is on very good terms with these also, and they are not at all bigoted, but appear kindly disposed, and have even been instrumental in inducing a young woman, a Protestant of their acquaintance, to present herself as a candidate for baptism in the church.—Next door lives a large family, the father in a good trade, earning not less than thirty shillings a week when in full employ; but they never lay by any thing, and, work failing recently, they have gone through a period of very urgent distress. They are professedly Church people, but seldom enter a place of worship. Of late, however, they *have* entered church now and then, and are, it may be hoped, upon the road to amendment. They are very fair-

spoken people, and their neighbours call them "smooth-tongues." The eldest son, a printer, invariably passes almost the whole of the Sunday walking in the country with other young journey-men, and yet seems to have a kindly feeling towards the Church and clergyman, and does occasionally go to some church in the evening with his sweetheart; more, it is to be feared, for the sake of her company than from any other motive.—Next door there resides, again, a very large family downstairs; the father is engaged on the fire-patrol, and so is always up all night; the mother works very hard in a manufactory for about twelve hours every day in the week with the eldest boy. They say they are worn out on the Sunday, and really appear so; but the man sometimes goes to church in the evening, and the eldest boy does so always, as well as the younger children. This lad of sixteen seemed rather ashamed of his good practices when the clergyman spoke to him kindly on the subject: this, however, was probably only the effect of English reserve, which strongly influences all classes, and is especially conspicuous at that period of life.—Upstairs in this same house lives a very worthy old couple; one, the old woman, bedridden; the other, a small infirm and humpbacked man, a Cornish tailor, with a remarkably intelligent countenance. His is real, earnest, practical religion; religion that has supported him under great troubles, and enables him to endure contentedly no slight privations in the present day; he is at the same time a sound Churchman, and takes great delight in the perusal of our best Church of England authors. He is exceedingly sensible, and the accounts he gives of the past occurrences of his life, and of the habits of his trade, are both entertaining and instructive; but it cannot be denied that he is rather discursive in his discourses; in fine, somewhat of a gossip. His wife is a very good and unpretending creature. A middle-aged, hardworking woman lives with this aged couple, a sincere Christian in word and deed, who devotes herself to their necessities, and works much harder in consequence than she otherwise would need to do, though she never misses an opportunity of attending both the Sunday and daily services, when she can do so without neglecting her more immediate duties.

This, after the many disagreeable pictures we have presented to our readers, has so comparatively pleasant an aspect, that we shall make it the last upon our list, without travelling farther round the court, though some four or five more families reside in it, who attend church, more or less regularly, and are well disposed, and well conducted, on the whole. Four or five others are Roman Catholics, but not as favourable specimens of that sect; some violent and quarrelsome, others bitter and

bigoted; though continuous kindness of treatment appears to have modified their feelings for the better; and this, notwithstanding that the clergyman in question frequently points out the errors of popery from his pulpit. Some four or five other families remain, who, like the two first particularized, seem to frequent no place of worship, though only one or two of these are violently ill-conducted. And, on the whole, this court is no unfair, though perhaps rather too favourable, a specimen of the parish, and of multitudes of London parishes besides.

The poor in other cities and large towns are, we fear, for the more part, equally inattentive to their religious duties, though, we are happy to say, that this by no means is the case in smaller towns, and still less so in the agricultural parishes, where the influence of the parochial clergy is more fully brought to bear.

And now, in conclusion, let us ask, does this faithful, as far as it goes, though very imperfect representation of the state of the working classes contain very much to discourage exertion, or any thing to awaken despair? We hope not. On the virtues of the poor, and they are many, we have not dwelt. They are, in the main, we think, less irritable than their wealthier brethren, and bear more kindly with one another's failings, save when they are under the influence of liquor; they are singularly kind and self-denying in their exertions in all cases of sickness; often this seems the one redeeming point in an otherwise wretched character; they are generally industrious, and do not seem to dislike working from morning till night; they are exceedingly charitable to one another, and are usually ready to share the last crust with a neighbour in distress; sometimes they are truly and deeply religious; and religion in the poor, when it is real, is very beautiful; they are grateful for kindness, when it is not pompously and fussily bestowed, and are particularly open to the influences of truth and candour. In fact, they are a noble-hearted race by nature; and our heart warms towards them while we write, despite their usually sad neglect of religious ordinances, first taught them by our oblivion of their existence. Surely such a race as this *must* be reclaimable.

The great problem seems to be, how to retain possession of the hearts and intellects of the young, from the age of fourteen to that of twenty, when they too usually run wild, and get into evil habits, the effects of which endure to the last hour of their lives. The formation of week-day evening classes would seem, upon the whole, the most promising remedy for this great evil; classes, not for French or Latin, save in exceptional cases for a rather higher order, but for English composition, including, of

course, writing, spelling, and grammar, and for arithmetic. History might be the theme chosen for the composition of written essays ; but then it is, in our judgment, very desirable that that history should be first read and expounded by the parish clergy ; and here we are making a fresh demand upon their time. Yet, might not one hour, or an hour and a half, be devoted, without much difficulty, to this work, on say two evenings in the week ? For it is manifestly all-important to keep the minds and hearts of the young, of young men more especially, under the influence of their natural friends and counsellors. It would be wrong to allude to this subject without recognizing the valuable services of the Metropolitan Society for Evening Classes, more especially of its Secretary and great promoter, the Rev. C. Mackenzie.

Amusing and instructive lectures once a week, or once a fortnight, may assist in this good work, to which men, and women also, should be admitted ; for we despair of gaining the adults generally through the children, though this is a very favourite notion in our days ; the adults are far more likely to corrupt the children : we must begin at both ends at once, if we would succeed. The influence of the penny literature of the day is another most important consideration on which, however, we cannot at present enter at the fag end of a long article ; we will only say, that while we appreciate the good motives which have induced various religious societies to put forth cheap periodicals of late, in which religion is sought to be blended with information and amusement, we incline to believe that these periodicals will prove partial failures in their effect. Some of the cheap penny papers, such as the "Family Herald," or Dickens' "Household Words," or certain of Cassell's publications, are well-principled, in the main ; and we do not like the insertion of Scripture texts, and exhortations from "Spiritual Treasuries," in the midst of entertaining fictions and dissertations on the tea trade. Of course we do not intend to depreciate the value of *directly religious* periodicals, such as "The Churchman's Penny Magazine ;" but we dislike the abrupt transitions from the most awful themes to gossip of the lightest order, which we have remarked in recent publications of the Religious Tract Society, and others of the like nature. This is a subject well worthy of a separate article. For the present we will only say that interference with the light reading of the poor may be carried too far ; and that though it is exceedingly desirable that there should be penny publications, not breathing a refined heathenism, as "Chambers' Journal" too frequently does, but in the hands of honest and practical Churchmen, yet we would not have them directly religious in their

tone and bearing, any further than the novels of Mr. James may be so considered, or any work, the author of which is actuated by good principles.

But, by some means or other, by evening classes, by lectures, by the influence of papers and periodicals, (Oh! that there were only one thoroughly *popular* Church-newspaper; not for the educated classes only, like the "Guardian," clever and brilliant, or for the clergy, and those more immediately connected with parochial business, like the high-principled, and, we may say, almost too honest "English Churchman," which never shrinks from offending friends, when duty calls for speech! Oh! that we had a *threepenny* paper, conducted by earnest-hearted, sensible, energetic men, who knew the English people and their wants! He were a patriot, indeed, who would sink some thousands to start such a paper!) but, by all these means combined, and others we have not time to specify, we must endeavour to win the hearts, and steady the intellects of the young, and make them feel proud of friendship with the clergy, *not ashamed of their best feelings*; and, if we do not succeed in this, the next generation can be no better than the present. And, with the many contrary influences that are brought to bear on the people, those of socialism, and chartism, and democracy generally, making them discontented with their present stations, and filling their minds with animosity towards their social superiors generally, and more especially towards the clergy, as overseers feed by the more fortunate classes to keep the wretched in subjection to their bondage, may we not fear, that the next generation will be far worse? Let us, then, at whatever sacrifice to our own ease and comfort, employ any or all of these means of *social redemption*. Frequent services, and open churches, and plain and earnest pulpit-discourses, are all most desirable, and essential; but these will not avail without efforts to persuade our poorer brethren that we are really anxious to raise them in the *social scale*; that we feel for them, and with them, as brothers, and as men.

And, after all, neither evening classes nor lectures will conciliate and win, unless we seek the poor in their own dwellings, and familiarize ourselves with their sufferings and their joys. If we have not succeeded in impressing on our readers the necessity for this parochial visitation—this *Clerical* visitation—we have written altogether vainly. The poor will not love us, nor respect us, once more we assure our Clerical readers, (many of whom, doubtless, set an example to ourselves in this matter, which we can only humbly aspire to follow:) but the working classes will not enter our churches, nor trust their clergy, unless they are regularly and

constantly visited by the latter in their own houses ; and this, not mainly for the purpose of exhortation, but for the sake of expressing sympathy, and of affording relief.

We need scarcely say, that this work *cannot* be accomplished by the clergy, unless the laity assist them, so as to stock their purses for such ends. Often and often, after working for an hour or two, we have known a clergyman desist most unwillingly from his labours, though a tempting row or lane invited him, because he was compelled to confess to himself, that he had already given away more money than he ought that day, (having met with many painful cases,) more than he had, strictly speaking, any right to give. For though the clergy may not have occasion to relieve, possibly, in one room out of three or four, still they will find it next to impossible to visit without having the means of relieving at hand. We trust that we need not enlarge upon this subject. If the laity wish the poor of the flock to look up to their pastors as their friends and counsellors, they *must* entrust to their hands no small portion of the funds they may appropriate to charitable purposes, to be distributed at their discretion.

We need not say, that in the working of any parish, the system of relief by tickets for bread, or coals, or grocery, as the case may be, will be found altogether indispensable. Lay district visitors should, almost always, have such tickets, and tickets only, to dispose of, save when they may feel called upon to relieve distress from their own private purses : and even the clergy will do well to give assistance frequently, or generally, through this ticket medium, which guards, in a great measure, against imposition ; not entirely so, because the tickets may be, and sometimes are, bought and sold, as we know for a fact. Sometimes, however, no tickets will reach or meet the case, and the giving of money is often regarded as a mark of special confidence, which excites a much more kindly feeling towards the giver than the distribution of parochial " orders."

We fear that many of our readers will judge us to be as lax in our theory, as in our practice, and altogether infinitely too indulgent. Severity, we believe, however, cannot now work well. Let us not crush the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax. Love, and love only, can effect the moral miracle which we desire. It is the love of Christ our Lord which can alone transform the inner man of any one of us to some faint resemblance to the image of that Lord of Glory ; and the love of the Church, the minister of Christ, must awaken the torpid instincts for good that now lie dormant in the hearts of our poorer brethren.

Surely, the great battle with evil may yet be fought and won ; surely, with new churches rising in all directions, and hearts that

can feel for our brethren's wrongs and sufferings, the great work of reformation and renovation will not be left unattempted or unwrought at last ! O, for more of honest zeal, for more of the spirit of true self-devotion to fire our hearts, that the Lord of the vineyard may not come suddenly, and find his vineyard-dressers sleeping at their posts ! Have we not all need to pray, in the words of our holy Bishop Andrewes, that " God would strengthen those things that remain, and supply those that are yet wanting ? " that He would bring about, in his own good time, regular and systematic habits of spiritual intercourse betwixt pastor and people ? and, in the mean while, that He would give us grace at least, to labour amongst, and with, the working classes as our brethren ?—So would that glorious prophecy, which began to be fulfilled, as we believe, in our own dear Church at the period of the Reformation, receive its full and perfect consummation, that *she* should be " the repairer of the breach, the restorer of paths to dwell in ; " yea, that, first regenerating her own children, she should prove the appointed instrument, under God, for the redemption of Christendom from the influences of infidelity, and of Romish superstition, and from that last and deadliest of enemies, the personal Antichrist, whom, in common with the majority of our brethren, we still anticipate, " the latest monster-birth of time."

Imperfectly have we discharged our self-allotted task. On the difficult subject of Sunday trading, we have not at all entered, though we cannot terminate without expressing our horror at that desecration of the Lord's own day of holy rest, which is visible every Sunday morning throughout the poorer half of the metropolis. Nor have we touched on the subject of schools, save by a very insufficient reference to the working of evening classes. Lending-libraries, baths and wash-houses, and reading-rooms, and countless practical suggestions for the removal of social evils, we have not space to enter on ; suffice it, for the present, if we have established the necessity for social intercourse between pastors and people ; for friendly, regular, and constant Parochial Visitation.

ART. II.—1. *The Christian's Hope in Death: a Series of Sermons on the Burial Service of the Church of England.* By J. ENDELL TYLER, B.D. London: Parker and Son. 1852.

2.—*The Rector's Address to his Parishioners of St. Giles's in the Fields.* By J. ENDELL TYLER, B.D. London. 1851.

THERE is something unspeakably refreshing and consolatory in the thought that often while the Church appears, externally, to be in hysterics and convulsions, she may, nevertheless, be really in a state of much more internal healthfulness than the world in general is apt to imagine; that, while the visible symptoms may be terrifying enough to make the anxious friends of the venerable patient shake their heads in despair, the vital powers within may be achieving their work with regular and noiseless activity. The spasmodic *phænomena*, doubtless, indicate a somewhat abnormal condition of the system: but, still, the morbid appearances may possibly be superficial, and (so to express it) chiefly *muscular*. They do not, *necessarily*, afford any certain ground for prognosticating deep-seated malady, much less for apprehending decay and dissolution. For instance, at this very moment, a brain-sickly observer might look with an agony of alarm upon the perplexing signs of the times. What with Puseyite controversies, and Gorham litigations, and Royal Supremacy debates, and claims of Education, and Frome disputes, and the heavings and stirrings of Convocation from its long and troubled sleep, and, lastly, the uprising of the national mind against Ultramontane mendacity and insolence,—what with all these unquiet manifestations together,—the very air around us seems absolutely maddened¹ with the elements of strife; and ruin, at times, appears all but inevitable. And yet, all this while, be it remembered, there are some twelve or fourteen thousand preachers of righteousness upholding, Sabbath after Sabbath, the Lord's controversy against the World, the Flesh, and the Devil, or carrying, during the week, their peaceful ministrations to the chamber of sickness, and the dwellings of ignorance, and whispering of the peace which passeth understanding, and the hope full of immortality. With these considerations before us, we may listen with something like tolerable composure to the stunning discords which assail us, and grapple,

¹ Δορυρινάκτος αἰθῆρ ἐπιμαίνεται. Æschylus.

manfully and *hopefully*, with the difficulties which throng our path; unless, indeed, *Hope* has ceased to be numbered among the Christian Graces!

The above thoughts have been occasioned by the two publications at the head of this notice. They are the work of one of the most faithful and laborious of our preachers of righteousness; one who, for twenty-five years, was the spiritual guide of a parish, the very name of which calls up visions of every imaginable department of usefulness which can task the energies of a devoted evangelist:—a vast and swarming population, born for the most part, to all appearance, under evil stars of vice, and ignorance, and poverty. With what indomitable strength of purpose he gave himself up to the work of taming that moral jungle, it is needless for us to report; seeing that this is well known to all men who have ever heard his name. He is now gone, we may humbly trust, to his exceeding great reward; and the Sermons now before us form a posthumous specimen of his pastoral labours in the pulpit.

Considered *merely* under a literary aspect there is, in these discourses, but little, perhaps, to distinguish them from many other vigorous and faithful expositions of divine truth. But, there is one thing about them which is eminently striking; and that is the spirit of intense earnestness and heartiness by which they are pervaded. They are written much as a man might be supposed to write, who felt as if the eternal destinies of his whole audience depended upon the words he was uttering. This might, to some extent, be exemplified by a large transcription of extracts; but, after all, nothing short of a perusal of the whole series can do adequate justice to the powers and temper of the writer. We shall accordingly limit our notice chiefly to certain somewhat debateable points which unavoidably present themselves to a preacher, or commentator, on the Burial Service of the Church of England.

First, then, it may perhaps be doubted whether Mr. Tyler's exposition of 1 Cor. xv. 22, will meet with universal acquiescence: "As in Adam, *all* die, even so, in Christ, *all* shall be made alive:"—"All, that is," (says the preacher,) "who sleep in Jesus,—who are proved to be Christ's at his coming." This interpretation, doubtless, exhibits a momentous and unquestionable truth. But, does it embrace the whole truth? We rather apprehend not; at least, if this passage is to be viewed by the light of the fifth chapter to the Romans, which tells us that, as by the disobedience of *the one man* (Adam), *the many* (οἱ πολλοί) were made sinners, so by the obedience of *the one* (Christ), the many (οἱ πολλοί) shall be made righteous: in which passage, as Bentley

contends, (in his noted sermon on that text,) the signification of οἱ πολλοί, in the latter part of the sentence, must be coextensive with the signification of the same words, οἱ πολλοί, in the former part of it. And if Bentley is right, we can scarcely give to the word *all*, in the latter clause of the text now before us, a narrower sense than that which clearly belongs to the same word, *all*, in the former part of it. It would appear, indeed, from the sequel of Mr. Tyler's exposition, that *his* view of Rom. v. is not coincident with that of Bentley; and that he considers the words οἱ πολλοί as capable of a restricted sense in their application to those who are said to be *made righteous*: so that he is, throughout, entirely consistent with himself. For ourselves, we are inclined to the opinion that the words, *the many shall be made righteous*, have reference to the potential deliverance; the redemption which was obtained for all, without distinction of tribe, family, or nation; and the blessings of which are within the reach of all, if all would come to Christ, in faith and repentance. And, a manifest analogy suggests, as we conceive, the true interpretation of 1 Cor. xv. 22. In Adam, *all* die;—*all*, without exception; seeing that death passed upon the whole human race. In Christ, then, *all*,—equally without exception,—shall be made alive. *All* shall, alike, be redeemed from death, and destined to immortal life: although, alas! there are many to whom, eventually, their immortality will prove to be any thing rather than a blessing. Possibly, Mr. Tyler may in part have been led to his own view of the text, by the circumstance that St. Paul, in addressing the Corinthians, is so rapt in contemplation of the glory reserved for the spirits of the just, that, for the time, he seems to forget the children of perdition, and to lose sight of their fearful doom. But, whether Mr. Tyler's interpretation be correct, or not, we, at all events, accept very gladly his wise caution against all rash speculation, touching the fate of them that are lost, and the manner of their resurrection.

The *intermediate state*, of course, is one of the questionable matters sure to claim the attention of an expositor of our Burial Service: and, relative to this subject, also, Mr. Tyler (as might be expected) most urgently and largely inculcates extreme sobriety of thought. He contends that it is "unwise and unsafe in Christians so to pursue the inquiry, as though they were in search of essential and vital truth." He "believes it to be a subject on which the Holy Spirit has made no clear and direct revelation;" and that "the reason why it is not revealed, is, because it is not necessary for us to learn; because, as a principle, it can be of no importance to us, one way or the other." "Of what moment," he asks, "can it be to us, to *know* what will be the

state of our souls between death and judgment?" These words of caution are all the more necessary, because there are probably, at this moment, hundreds who *do* regard this as a matter of the very gravest importance; hundreds whose hearts are racked by the solemn problem of the intermediate state of souls; and who are ready to listen to the "sophist fiend," when he whispers the Romish solution of that problem. Our readers will understand that we are now, more especially, alluding to the doctrine of purgatory; a doctrine which our Church denounces as "a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but, rather, repugnant to the word of God:" but which doctrine, nevertheless, is, in this our day, beguiling many an anxious soul, and bewitching many an unquiet fancy. In order, therefore, that simple and unguarded Protestants may be prepared against the artifices of the "sophist fiend," we transcribe a somewhat lengthy passage from a recent publication²; not, most certainly, from any extravagant admiration of the whole work itself; but simply because we verily believe this passage to contain a faithful exhibition of the present operation of this strong delusion. Indeed, we have seen something much to the same effect in some recent number of the "Dublin Review." Be it observed, then, that the following words are put, by the author of the work in question, into the mouth of one of his characters; a sort of "moonish youth" of a Tractarian curate, just dropping into the jaws of the basilisk:—

"What would Protestants have known of a future state but for Rome? Rome says there are three realms in the future state,—Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory. What right have Protestants to throw away the latter, and arbitrarily retain the two former? I am told that Scripture gives no warrant for a third state. Rome says that it does; that is, teaches it implicitly, as it teaches other doctrines, even the very highest; some hold, the Trinity itself. It *may* be proved from Scripture; for, it may be proved from the love and justice of God, revealed in Scripture. The Protestants divide (in theory) mankind into two classes; the righteous, who are destined to infinite bliss; the wicked, who are doomed to infinite torment. In which latter case, to make their arbitrary division exhaustive, they put, of course, nine hundred and ninety-nine out of the thousand; and doom to everlasting companionship with Borgias and Cagliostros, the gentle frivolous girl, or the peevish boy, who would have shrunk, in life, with horror from the contact. Well, at least, their Hell is hellish enough; if it were but just! But, I cannot believe it. I will not believe it. I had a brother once, affectionate, simple, full of noble aspirations; but, alas! without a thought of God: yielding, in a hundred little points,—and some great ones,

² *Yeast; a Problem*, p. 134, &c. Parker, West Strand. 1851.

too,—to the infernal temptations of a public school. He died at seventeen. Where is he now? Never, for a day, has that thought left my mind for years. Not in Heaven,—for he has no right there: Protestants would say that as well as I. Where then? Not in that other place. I cannot, I will not believe it. For the sake of God's honour, as well as of my own sanity, I will not believe it! There must be some third place,—some intermediate chance,—some door of hope,—some purifying process beyond the grave. Ages of that are surely punishment enough. And if there be a fire of Hell, why not a fire of Purgatory? . . . If the gross flesh which has sinned is to be punished by the matter which it has abused, why may it not be purified by it?"

And now mark what follows:—

"It is just the very doctrines for which England most curses Rome, and this Purgatory at the head of them, which constitute her strength and her allurements; which appeal to the reason, the conscience of men, like me, who have revolted from the novel superstition, which looks pitilessly on the fond memories of the brother, the prayers of the orphan, the doubled desolation of the widow, with its cold and terrible assurance,—there is no hope for thy loved and lost ones; no hope, but Hell for evermore!"

Never, in this world, we believe, were truer words spoken, than those which we have above marked with italics. The most pernicious of Rome's peculiarities *are* precisely those which form her allurements and her strength! But now, what shall be said to all this sentimental and effeminate sophistry? Our author himself provides an answer which ought to be sufficient; an answer which harmonizes admirably with Mr. Tyler's earnest appeals against the madness of being wise beyond what is written. This answer, however, is put by him into the mouth of another of his characters,—a strong-minded, noble-hearted Cornish peasant; one who had also lost a brother, and had been tortured by doubts respecting that brother's condition in the unseen world. And the end of all his mental conflicts is just this,—that we must

"give up sticking to arguments and doctrines about the Lord, and love and trust the Lord Himself. I believe (he adds) that the Judge of all the earth will do right; and, what is right cannot be wrong, nor cruel either; else, it would not be like Him who loved us to the death. That is all I know; and that is enough for me. To whom little is given, of him will little be required. He that didn't know his Master's will, will be beaten with few stripes; and, he that did know it, as I do, will be beaten with many, if he neglects it: and, that latter, not the former, is my concern."

Thus speaks the Cornish peasant, *rusticus abnormis sapiens*; and we have no doubt whatever that Mr. Tyler, had he been

present, would, in his hearty way, have lustily patted the honest fellow on the back. It may be doubted, however, whether this sort of *exegesis* would afford much satisfaction to the moonish Tractarian curate. For he is full of jealousy for God's honour and justice, and benignity; all of which forbid the thought of a penal eternity for any but the impenitent and incorrigible reprobates! And, moreover, he has been taught that the Church has found the doctrine of purgatory *implicitly*, if not articulately, revealed in Scripture. That the Church of Rome has found the doctrine, somehow, and somewhere, is unhappily notorious. And the process by which she has found it, is equally notorious; as a very moderate acquaintance with Christian antiquity will show. No impartial student of Church History and Literature can fail to see that Rome has deduced, or *developed*, her purgatorial theory, partly out of a few meagre and most ambiguous sentences of Scripture; and partly, out of certain scattered, obscure, and discordant notices and intimations, in several Christian writers of the earlier centuries. So much for the *implicit* sanction claimed for this fond invention! As for the notion that the purgatorial scheme is required for the vindication of God's honour and justice,—its rashness is utterly self-destructive. For, on the one hand, it may, indeed, be beyond our limited faculties clearly and fully to discern how even the very worst thoughts, words, and deeds of a span-long life can be righteously punished by an eternity of wretchedness. But then, on the other hand, it is scarcely less difficult to see how the lighter failings and offences can be justly visited with *whole ages* of purgatorial torment. Indeed, we are lost in astonishment at the state of mind which can enable any reasoning man to derive substantial relief from such an hypothesis. What miserable consolation must it be to the bereft mother, or the widowed wife, to be assured that their lost ones are secure from everlasting pains; and that their souls shall find rest and peace, at the end of a thousand, or a myriad, or perhaps a million of years? (for there is absolutely no limit to the wild excursions of "unlicensed thought.") Why, the prospect of a duration so frightful is almost as oppressive to the mind as eternity itself! Foolish Tractarian young gentleman! Leave thy poor brother to the care of a faithful Creator, and most merciful Saviour and Judge. Listen, once again, to the Cornish peasant:—

"If we cannot conceive what God has prepared for those that we know loved Him, how much less can we conceive what He has prepared for them, of whom we don't know whether they loved Him, or not!"

Of the vile and odious superstitions which have grown out of this same doctrine of purgatory; of the ignoble, nay, impious traffic in masses and indulgences; of these, our Tractarian, of course, says nothing. It is much more to his purpose, and that of his fraternity, to pour contempt and obloquy upon us poor narrow-hearted Protestants; who (as he is pleased to affirm) consign to perdition some nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of the human race. "These be very bitter words!" But they inflict no discomposure upon us. We leave the School of Geneva to vindicate its own *doctrina immisericors*. As for us, Anglican Protestants,—the spirit which regulates our thoughts upon the subject of future retribution, may best be learned from the following words of old Fuller:—

"In the parable of the four sorts of ground, whereon the seed was sown, the last alone proved fruitful. There the bad were more than the good.

"But, among the servants, two improved their talents, and one buried them. There the good were more than the bad.

"Again, among the ten virgins, five were wise, and five foolish. There, the good and the bad were equal.

"I see that, concerning the number of the Saints, in comparison with the Reprobates, no certainty can be collected from these parables. Good reason: for, it is not their principal purpose to meddle with that point.

"Grant, Lord, that I may never rack a Scripture *simile* beyond the true intent thereof; lest, instead of sucking milk, I squeeze out blood." —Fuller: "Good Thoughts in Bad Times."

To which wise and truly charitable words we have only to add, that, in our Lord's division of the world into sheep and goats, there is no intimation whatever of the comparative numbers of these two classes. And, from such instances as these, we learn to perceive how dangerous and how presumptuous it always is, to *draw blood* from the language of Scripture, wherever it shadows forth to us the general doctrine of final retribution.

Mr. Tyler's twelfth sermon contains a statement, which may, possibly, startle some thoughtful Christians:—

"It is very evident that the Apostles were allowed to remain under many decided mistakes as to the time of Christ's second advent, and the end of the world. . . . Can it, then, be profitable, can it be edifying to us, to search into those points, on which the Apostles were left, not only in ignorance, but even in palpable error?"

What shall we say, then? How shall we quiet the pious scruples and misgivings of those who tremble at the thought of ascribing liability to error to men who wrote and acted under

Divine guidance and control? If those men were really mistaken respecting this one matter, how shall we be certain that error may not be lurking, here and there, throughout the whole compass of their narratives and expositions? And how shall we be able to maintain inviolate the sacred theory of their inspiration? These questions are not without their difficulties; difficulties which it might well require a separate treatise completely to dispose of. Nevertheless, we are satisfied that their weight may be much reduced by a little patient consideration.

In the first place, then, of all the startling passages in Scripture, we know of scarcely one so startling as that of Mark xiii. 32; where our Lord speaks, either of the fall of Jerusalem, or of the end of the world, in the following language: *περὶ δὲ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, ἢ τῆς ὥρας, οὐδεὶς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱὸς, εἰ μὴ ὁ Πατήρ*; which words, we think, may be correctly rendered thus: "But, except the Father, no one (*οὐδεὶς*) knoweth of that day, or that hour; no, not the angels which are in heaven, nor the Son." Here, then, we have a statement, which seems to imply that our Lord was positively ignorant of the day when He Himself should come, either to smite down Jerusalem, or to judge the world; that a future event, the time of which must have been distinctly known to the Son of God, was actually hidden from the Son of man! It is needless to specify the efforts of the ancient Fathers³, or of the modern commentators, to extricate themselves from the difficulty of this most mysterious announcement. Perhaps, no exposition has yet been offered sufficient to relieve us from a severe demand upon our humility and faith. Thus much, however, may, at least, be collected from it; that, since our Lord speaks of the subject as one which was then veiled from *his* humanity, it was hardly to be expected that his Apostles should be gifted with unerring insight touching the same matter. It is not improbable that "their vivid feeling anticipated the day; that the interval between, so to speak, was *foreshortened* to them⁴." Still, it must be confessed, that one perplexing question remains unsolved. If the Apostles really were in error, how comes it that they were allowed to circulate their erroneous notions so widely among the faithful? How comes it that they were permitted so to express themselves, that, in spite of St. Paul's explanation to the Thessalonians, the expectation of our Lord's immediate coming should become the reigning delusion of the times, throughout the distresses of the Jewish war⁵? This, we apprehend, is a question

³ They may be seen in Suicer's Thesaurus, tom. ii. col. 164—170.

⁴ See "The Eclipse of Faith," p. 65.

⁵ See Bp. Horsley's Sermon ii. on Matt. xxiv. 3.

which we must be content to leave in some obscurity ; resting assured, at the same time, that whatever may have been the misconceptions of the Apostles, they were not permitted without some wise and salutary purpose ; and that, eventually, they were overruled for good. But, be this as it may, one thing, at all events, is clear,—that the saying of our Lord virtually lays an interdict on all human calculations and conjectures, relative to the day and hour of his appearing. And, accordingly, every sober-minded Christian must heartily approve Mr. Tyler's condemnation of all such speculative vanities :—

“ If (he says) St. Peter and St. Paul, when they thought and spoke on these things, were left to their own mistaken views, we may be sure the Holy Spirit intended Christians not to perplex themselves by such unsatisfactory speculations. And if we trace the history of the Christian Church through the many ages that have elapsed between the days of the Apostles and our own, we shall find that over and over again have men boldly pronounced on the near approach of the day of judgment, or the second advent of Christ to reign on earth, fixing upon the very year of its arrival ; and that one after another they have all by the event been convicted of folly, and presumption, and error. We are struck also with the glaring fact, that with these errors have ever been mingled others of a practical and pernicious tendency. On the whole, then, we are compelled by the words of Christ, by the general tenour of Holy Scripture, and by the history of the Church, to conclude that it is not a Christian duty, but self-willed vanity ; it is not piety, but presumption ; it is not edifying, but deceitful, to attempt to fix upon the time when Christ shall come at his second advent, and when the end of the present state of things on earth shall arrive. And, therefore, as humble, faithful, pious followers of Christ, we are exhorted to leave that subject alone for ever, and devote ourselves to the essential doctrines of the Gospel, and those studies which may throw light upon them.”—Serm. xii. pp. 188, 189.

The nineteenth sermon brings before us a question which, at this moment, is agitating many a tender conscience, and many a vigorous understanding ; the question, whether that portion of the Funeral Office, which follows after the consignment of the corpse to its last resting-place, can be much longer suffered to remain without some well-considered modification ? The main objection to this portion (expressed in a recent petition, signed by members of all parties), may be stated in Mr. Tyler's own words, namely,—

“ that the minister of the Church is directed to call every departed person a *dear brother*, however unchristian may have been his character in life ; and to pronounce, of all alike, that God, of his mercy, had taken the soul of the deceased unto Himself. ‘ Is not this, (say the

objectors,) to confound the good with the bad, and to put the most desperate worker of wickedness on a footing with the most exemplary and saint-like Christian ?' "

The same objection, must, of course, be extended to that passage of the concluding collect, which contains the prayer that, "when we shall depart this life, we may rest in Christ, *as our hope is, this our brother doth.*" In spite of this objection, however, Mr. Tyler passionately deprecates all tampering or change. He vindicates the office, as it stands, in a passage too long to be extracted, and far too eloquent and earnest to be abridged without injury to its effect. It must be sufficient to state, that his vindication rests upon the principle that every religious service should be a mirror, in which believers may see, not what the generality of Christians are, but what all Christians ought to be ; not what is most agreeable to the prejudices of the world, but what the world must be, before the world can become the kingdom of Christ : in short, that every service should be such, that we may learn our duty from our devotional exercises. It must be observed, however, that Mr. Tyler does not accept the explanation, sometimes offered, viz. that, when "we commit the body of the departed to the ground, in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life," we do no more than merely express our own undoubted hope of a general resurrection, without reference to the spiritual condition or probable doom of the departed : on the contrary, he contends that our Church, in her Burial Service,—

"throughout, intended to prepare a service for the funeral of a true Christian, who died in the true faith, and fear, and love of God ; a service to be used by such as are living in the true faith, and fear, and love of Christ our Saviour."

And he concludes his appeal to the heart of Christian love, with these touching words :—

"Oh, my brethren, those who have really once felt the support, and strength, and comfort, and refreshing, conveyed to the mourning heart by this sentence, at the grave of one we loved, will join with me in hoping that the hand of the spoiler and the destroyer will never be allowed to rob us of these comfortable words ; that no cold, calculating criticism will change this heavenly assurance for a vague, general, chilling acknowledgment of a resurrection to judgment."

Alas ! the hand of "the spoiler and destroyer" has actually been at work in the Church of our American brethren ! And the manner in which it has wrought, may be seen in the substitution of what Mr. Tyler calls a "cold and general acknowledg-

ment for our fervent and glowing confession." The substitute for our glowing confession is as follows :—

" ' Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, in his wise providence, to take out of this world the soul of our deceased brother, we therefore commit his body to the ground ; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust : looking for the general resurrection at the last day, and the life of the world to come.' And by this change," says Mr. Tyler, " our American brethren have done well, if it be well to make a sacrifice of high principle in order to avoid giving offence. They have done wrong, if it be well to enlarge our heart, and to hope all things, and to believe all things good : to trust God in all, without limit and without narrowing his mercy within the bounds of human calculation. For my own part, I thank God that this Service has been preserved to us, such as it is."

How much longer it is likely to be preserved to us, seems, at present, to be rather a questionable matter. In the mean time, we confess, that our sympathies, at least, are with the preacher. To our minds, the omission of all hopeful words over the remains of any deceased brother, would be something not very unlike to a posthumous sentence of excommunication. And for this reason, among others, we cannot but deplore the unquiet state of the public mind and conscience, relative to this part of the Church's Funeral Service.

One thing, however, we do most ardently hope, viz. that in case a reconsideration of that or any other formulary shall be found quite inevitable, the question will never have to weather the stormy cape of parliamentary discussion.

" It is impossible," says a distinguished dignitary of the Church, " to deny the utter unfitness of that assembly for a dignified, or even a decent, handling of spiritual matters. Its party passions, its composition, its habitude of secular debate, engender a painful sense of the incongruity of such discussions with the character of that assembly. *Nor is it unwilling itself to acknowledge such radical unfitness and virtual incompetency*⁶. These questions require a distinct spiritual assembly, under whatever name, to which the consideration of them may be referred, though the ultimate authoritative decision be not wholly in its hands⁷."

We all know with what intense ἀποκαταδοκία many are now looking forward to the revival of Convocation, for a *peaceful* settlement of this and various other questions which have recently been distracting the Church. Whether or not these expectations are somewhat over-sanguine, we shall not here undertake to

⁶ The italics are ours.

⁷ See the recent Charge of the Archdeacon of Chichester, p. 76.

inquire. But thus much we hold to be quite certain, that, Convocation or no Convocation, the preliminary treatment, at least, of all such questions, must be committed to some sort of Ecclesiastical conference, commission, or other deliberative body (whether exclusively clerical or not), if sacred things are to be protected from the danger of foul indignity and desecration.

In Sermon XXI., Mr. Tyler notices another objection to the Funeral Service. There are some who look impatiently, and even angrily, on the following passage :—

“ We give thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world.”

The framers of our Liturgy—it is complained—seem here to have forgotten that Christianity itself cannot extinguish, and was never meant to extinguish, the deepest and tenderest impulses of our nature. It is too much to expect that the bereft husband, the widowed mother, the orphan children, should lift up the voice of thanksgiving for a visitation which may bury every earthly hope, and may threaten the survivors with the loss of all that can make life endurable. The very utmost that can reasonably be demanded of the mourners, is, the expression of a pious acquiescence in the unsearchable dealings of the Almighty. To put into their mouths the language of praise and gratitude, while standing on the edge of the grave, is, often, little better than a mockery of bursting hearts. Such is the impassioned reasoning of the malcontents. And here, again, we find, among the malcontents, our brethren of the Transatlantic Church, who have retained the words of thanksgiving, but have wholly changed the subject of it. Their formulary stands thus :—

“ We give thee hearty thanks for the good examples of all those thy servants, who, having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labours.”

Mr. Tyler, of course, protests against any such alteration.

“ We would on no account consent,” he says, *“ to have this oblation of thanksgiving removed from our Service, or substitute for it a vague and general acknowledgment of gratitude for the good examples of such as have died in the faith. And, should any one have seen this point in the same light with our American brethren, I would earnestly, in the spirit of love, at once, and of admonition, exhort such an one to trace carefully the feeling to its origin. Let him examine his heart, and ascertain whether either selfishness, or want of faith, or a defective and partial submission to Heaven’s will, be not the root and spring of the reluctance to join in the Church’s praise. At all events, let us take heed that our sentiments be no other than those of the patient*

man: *The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord.*"

We suspect that the objections to this part of our Service are founded on a narrow and mistaken view of the spirit in which it was composed. It is generally imagined that, when the minister pronounces the words, "*We* give thee hearty thanks, &c." he is giving utterance merely to the sentiments of those (himself included) who happen to be standing round the grave: whereas, according to a juster view, he is giving utterance to the sentiments of the Christian community at large. The Church is, *constructively*, present at the solemnity; and, by the mouth of her minister, she, virtually, declares that the release of a Christian soul from the burden of the flesh, and the miseries of a sinful world, is, in its own nature, "*a consummation devoutly to be wished;*" an event to be met, not with dejection or despondency, but rather in a thankful, and even jubilant frame of mind. The word "*We*," should be understood to comprehend, not the bystanders only, but the whole brotherhood of the faithful; who, by a sort of truly pious fiction, which no Christian heart will ever repudiate, are supposed to be *assisting*, in spirit at least, at every holy Service wherewith the Church consoles, or elevates, her children. It may be true that, at the moment, the mourners, in their heaviness, may be unable to join in the Lord's song, or to listen to the voice which speaks of thanksgiving and triumph. But, sooner or later, they will confess that the voice spake faithfully and wisely; and, they will say among themselves, "*let us comfort one another with these words.*" It may be thought indeed by some, that this view of the subject is vastly too subtle, and refined; too remote from common apprehension to pacify the lacerated feelings, and to lift up the downcast spirit. We should be grieved, however, to see so poor an hallucination as this becoming prevalent; and we trust that it will find but little favour, if ever this sentence of the Funeral Service should be brought under revision.

Towards the close of Sermon XXI., we find a few remarks on the practice of praying for the souls of the departed: a practice which ought to share the fate of the purgatorial figment. "*Our Church*," says Mr. Tyler, "*never teaches us to pray for the dead.*" But, then, neither does our Church prohibit prayer for the dead; such, at least, is the ruling of our Spiritual Judicature. And hence it is that invitations to pray for the dead may be engraved on our monuments and tomb-stones; and, for aught we can tell, may, sooner or later, be written on the walls of our churches. For, have we not recently heard it maintained

as an axiom, that whatever is not explicitly forbidden by the letter of our formularies, is thereby implicitly allowed and sanctioned? And may it not, therefore, be desirable that the trumpet of Church-discipline should be made to render a somewhat less uncertain sound touching this practice, if the mind of the Church should ever again be allowed to express itself in synodical utterance? In saying this, however, we would not be supposed to look, with a pitiless eye, on what may perhaps be deemed an amiable superstition of the heart. To the promptings of this sort of superstition may, probably, be ascribed the early prevalence of this habit in the primitive Christian communities. And who, even at this day, is made of stuff so stern and hard, as to deny that when a beloved object is removed from us, the words, *God rest his soul*, are apt to rush into the heart, if not to mount up to the lips? And so long as these words express no more than a secret pious aspiration, an affectionate desire for the repose of the departed, so long they may possibly be blameless; or, at least, they may be forgiven. But here we stop. Beyond this, all indulgence must be dangerous. The moment the aspiration begins to form itself into a deliberate prayer, so as to become the exponent of a settled and formal belief,—that moment it should be rigorously suppressed. And, further, seeing that these sighings and breathings of a sorrowful heart have found no expression in our Church's formularies, so neither ought they visibly to embody themselves in her holy places. When thus ostentatiously made public, what are they but invitations and encouragements to the revival of purgatory—that is, of a superstition which the Church has emphatically denounced?

“The Rector's Address to his Parishioners,” (the other publication at the head of this Article), can scarcely fail to be deeply interesting to those who had the happiness of knowing Mr. Tyler, or of hearing his voice: more interesting, perhaps, than even the Sermons themselves. It is itself in fact a sermon, though delivered, not from the pulpit, but from the sick room of the preacher. It was composed when the writer had been confined to that sick room, for seven long months, by the disorder or complication of disorders, under which he eventually sank. From that chamber he never stepped forth again: and, being conscious that his end might probably be at hand, he was desirous to send out among his people the fittest of all *farewells*—a word of affectionate pastoral exhortation. He was more especially anxious to teach *them* the lesson, which the chamber of sickness had effectually taught *him*; namely, how awful a thing it is for mortal man to be left *alone with God*! The following are the words in which he expresses his own sense of that solitude of the soul:—

"The first subject of reflection, then, which the experience of my illness makes me desire to present to your minds, is the **INDIVIDUALITY OF DEATH**, or, as it has been called, the **INSULATION OF DEATH**. Perhaps no idea was ever more deeply or indelibly imprinted on my mind. In those hours of sinking, I felt that had the whole world been assembled around my bed to witness my departure, yet when the last moment came, that departure must be made by myself individually, singly, personally, myself alone, an insulated being, leaving all the witnesses of my dissolution behind. Although 'it is appointed unto all men once to die', yet our own death, our inevitable lot, we share in common with no other. Our beloved ones will watch over our bed of languishing, and provide for our every want, and anticipate our every wish; and many an interchange of the purest feelings of affection and sympathy may soothe our last hours, and tend also to reconcile our friends to their approaching loss; but when the last sigh is breathed, and the spirit has left its house of clay, mortal friends can partake in our death no longer; nay, soon, like Abraham, the nearest and most affectionate amongst them will require 'their dead to be buried out of their sight'. When walking, as we all shall walk, through the valley of the shadow of death, no friendly arm can support or accompany us, no mortal staff can be near to hold us up. So personal, so single, so individual, so insulated a thing is death."—p. 5.

And, again:—

"In the same manner as we have seen that there is an awful individuality and insulation in death, so is there a no less tremendous individuality and insulation in the judgment. Before God's tribunal we shall stand, every one individually, singly, each by himself, one by one, isolated, alone. Though the inhabitants of the universe were assembled on that day of wrath, that dreadful day, to witness its proceedings; and though all the children of mortality, from Adam's creation to that very hour, were gathered together to undergo the same trial with ourselves, yet we shall be there, each for himself, and by himself, as individually, as singly, and alone, as though no other trembling soul were nigh awaiting his doom, or as though in a secret closet, without one to witness it, the scrutiny were being carried on by Him alone who searcheth the heart. Holy Scripture abounds with evidence to the universality of the judgment of the last day; but no less does it bear witness to its individuality."—pp. 6, 7.

Yes; even so! In the hour of death, or in the day of judgment, each one of us must be *alone with GOD*. And with what feelings shall we then look back on our feverish and angry conflicts of opinion; our passionate contention for things which (though not without importance) sink into utter insignificance before the tremendous thought, that every soul of man must bear its own

* Heb. ix. 27.

* Gen. xxiii. 4.

burden ; that neither Church, nor priest, nor schoolman can share the burden with it, when called individually to stand in the presence of the Judge? The chamber of sickness, we have seen, made our dying pastor intimately familiar with that thought. And, under the influence of it, he closes his Address with an urgent exhortation to abstinence from unfruitful strife. Having first sorrowfully adverted to the manifold distractions of the time, he continues thus :—

“ But, Christian fellow-soldiers, if I have felt it my duty to advert here to the present lamentable state of things within the pale of our own Church, it has been mainly with the view of repeating, in this more lasting form of a printed address, the advice which those who have habitually attended divine worship in the mother church of St. Giles have often heard from the pulpit—advice in the adoption of which I have endeavoured myself, to the utmost of my power, to set you the example. That advice has been to us, clergy and laity alike, not to engage at all in this controversy as partisans on the one side or the other ; rather, I would say, to abstain from the controversy altogether.

“ This advice from the pulpit was the result of careful observation of what was going on around us, with a constant reference to those general principles of practical theology, which I had formed long before the sounds of this controversy were heard within our borders ; and an application—I trust, an unprejudiced application—of those principles to the events which were passing before our eyes. I must now add, that through many of the more recent months of my present seclusion from the world the subject has repeatedly occupied my thoughts, and the conclusion to which I have come is in clear and strong confirmation of my former views ; and I can now, even with greater confidence, reiterate my advice, ‘**ABSTAIN FROM THAT CONTROVERSY ALTOGETHER.**’ At the same time let me add an earnest invitation, that we would pray with fervency of heart, that should the lamentable issue, which some of our faithful brethren are disposed to forbode, be realized, we may be furnished with every variety of spiritual armour to resist the varied attacks of the enemies of our soul’s welfare, and be provided with a suitable antidote against every temptation which may assault us.

“ **ABSTAIN FROM THAT CONTROVERSY ALTOGETHER.**

“ In the first place, I would say, I never knew one individual, man or woman, enter upon that controversy with a zealous espousing of either side, and come out of it a better Christian. On the contrary, I have thought some of the brightest points of the Christian character have been tarnished, and the smell of the controversial heat has passed on the mind, and, for a time at least, settled there ; zeal has been substituted for charity ; and censoriousness has taken the place of humility and self-judgment. Head-divinity may have grown and increased ; heart-divinity has been (partially, at least) checked in its growth ;

whereas, in the balance of the sanctuary, one grain of the religion of the heart will outweigh a talent of knowledge and zeal without charity. I repeat my conviction that to engage in this controversy will be an impediment to our own personal progress in piety, holiness, and Christian love.

“No! my brethren, let us cleave to the Church of England as to our own beloved Mother; but let us cleave to her with the same spirit by which we should have been actuated twenty years ago. Let us frequent her worship and her ordinances, not, as the manner of some now is, jealously to scrutinize whether in the ministrations in which we join, there be not something more or less, something higher or lower, than our own standard would sanction; but let us go solely to offer to our Divine Benefactor holy worship with the tongue, and from the heart; to lift our minds to high and heavenly things; to strengthen our faith, purify and exalt our hope, and extend our charity; especially, let me add, to cultivate that essential branch of charity, which is now as rare among us as it is valuable—the grace of humility. This Christian grace seems almost to have been neglected and cast off by the young, as a feeble, degrading quality, unworthy of a philosophic age. But they may be assured, that as it is a grace highly prized in his disciple by the Divine Author of our faith; so to the disciple is it ever a source of that peace of God which passeth all understanding, and of that quietness and composure of mind which will best fit the earthly pilgrim for his journey to heaven. Let us, then, return from our church to our home (however humble or however noble that home may be), not censurers, but confirmed and comforted penitents; not with the jarring sounds of discord within and around us; not with the disappointment or the triumph of religious disputants; but carrying with us back into the bosom of our family that peace of God, which Christianity is commissioned by its blessed Author always to bring with it, and that calmness and sweetness of religious enjoyment which any form of restlessness or uncharitableness and strife can never fail to mar.”—pp. 25—27.

Such are the parting admonitions of this faithful servant of God: and we ardently hope that, with one limitation, they will be written on the hearts of his parishioners. The limitation is this;—the Address inculcates abstinence from the main controversy of the day; and, so far as the controversy is purely and simply a religious one, the counsel may be wise and salutary. But, then, it must never be forgotten that the controversy, so far as it relates to the pretensions of Rome, is not purely and simply a religious one. The *Romish System* (as distinguished from the erroneous dogmatic faith of Rome) is neither more nor less than a stupendous sacerdotal conspiracy against the liberties of the human race, both secular and spiritual. Against a polity like this, our controversy is national, and should be sleepless. It is

one in which the humblest Protestant parishioner of St. Giles's has an interest as deep as the magistrates, and statesmen, and nobles of the land. It is a controversy from which none can wholly abstain, without an abandonment of their duty, as members of the Church and State of England. And, we question not, that if he were still among us, Mr. Tyler would frankly agree to this limitation of the solemn warning :—*abstain from that controversy altogether.*

ART. III.—*The Practical Working of the Church of Spain.* By the Rev. FREDERICK MEYRICK, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. John Henry Parker: Oxford and London. 1852.

“SPAIN,” says the universally lamented Eliot Warburton, “is the country, of all Europe, in which imagination most delights to wander, and on which memory most loves to dwell. Those who know it only by its romantic history and racy literature can understand much of its deep interest ; but those alone who have gazed upon its glorious landscapes, and breathed its delicious climate, can fully appreciate the charm it possesses for the mind and body.

“No wonder that in the adventurous olden time this favoured land was fiercely fought for and fiercely defended. No wonder that chivalry was here carried to perfection, that poetry proclaimed its triumphs, that art in its finest forms illustrated them, and that civilization in its most gorgeous, though least consistent form, strove hard to find a shelter there.

“*But Rome, with her spiritual power, was more than a match for Spain with all her rich endowments.* The Pope ruled in the person of her kings ; priests held in their hands the conscience of her people. Never had the Church of the Seven Hills such power over any nation ; never had any nation such a claim upon her blessings ; for Spain was not only obedient but enslaved to her control. In the palace, in the prison, at the death-bed, by the bridal couch, every where and at all times, the priest was present and predominant. There was the most triumphant career of the Inquisition. There did the holy office exercise its functions uncontrolled ; there *auto-da-fés* were celebrated with the highest pomp, and the Church’s rebels perished by thousands in the flames.

“With all these spiritual blessings,” proceeds he, with bitter and well-merited irony, “superadded to her natural gifts, Spain ought surely to have been a perfect paradise. Yet it was not altogether, or indeed nearly so ; and what matter there was of congratulation or honest pride, was little referable to the *imperium in imperio* which Rome asserted over the souls and bodies of her Spanish slaves. Striking and sad contrasts met the eye two hundred years ago as they do now. Gorgeous cathedrals

encrusted by miserable huts; whole streets of monasteries swarming with mendicants; haughty palaces surrounded with filth; orange groves reeking with foul smells. The state of Spain was contemptible in the midst of its splendour and its pride, and its moral and political contrasts were equal to those of magnificence and squalor, that were ever neighbours to each other."

Such was the Practical Working of the Church of Spain at the close of the seventeenth—and such, *mutatis mutandis*, it continues to be in the middle of the nineteenth century. For the full and accurate account of that working we are indebted to the author of the very seasonable and interesting volume before us. We gladly avail ourselves of his own words to describe both the nature and the object of his very valuable compilation.

"In the year 1847, the Rev. James Meyrick, Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, was presented by the Bishop of Salisbury to the vicarage of Westbury, in the county of Wiltshire. Before two years were quite expired, broken health compelled him to leave his parochial work. Accordingly in the autumn of 1849, accompanied by some of his near relations, he proceeded to the south of Spain, stayed at Malaga during the winter and following spring, and after a visit to Seville returned to England. The following autumn, being again unable to face an English winter, he went back to Malaga, together with one of his companions of the last year, and instead of living at the English hotel took lodgings at a Spanish Casa de Pupilos, or boarding house. The first four chapters of the present volume consist of letters written during the first visit to Spain, those in the seven following chapters were written during the second year. The Rev. J. Meyrick's letters are marked by his initials J. M. Most of the rest, which have the initials F. M., were written by his companion, who, it will be seen, was a lady. They went out from England,"—we call the attention of our readers especially to the following statements—"They went out from England, one with a high respect, the other with a high admiration, for the spirit of many of the practices of Rome, such as retreats, sisterhoods, and the good work wrought by such institutions, and they shared in the distress and perplexity of mind caused by irregularities in ecclesiastical affairs in England. This respect and admiration was as yet untested by experience. What effect experience of the practical working of the Roman Church had upon their minds the following letters will show. It cleared off the mist which imagination often throws over the distance, and revealed the truth, that abroad as well as at home, in foreign systems as well as our own, there were great scandals and great evils, often the very same under which we suffer, often far greater both in kind and in degree. . . .

"A few of the present letters giving an account of the Home Mission at Malaga have already appeared in the form of a pamphlet;

the larger selection now made will give an opportunity to such as desire it, of following the progress of minds which began with the presumption, that in 'Catholic Spain' most things would be right, to the certainty that very many things were wrong, more contrary to God's revealed truth, more irregular, less reconcilable with God's glory and man's salvation, than any thing that could be found in the Church of England."—Preface, pp. v.—vii.

The value of such testimony is beyond all price, because it is above the possibility of suspicion. Here are two persons, the one of them disposed to respect—the other to admire the practical working of Romanism—and both of them apparently somewhat dissatisfied with their own Church, and perplexed, if not unsettled in their minds. They return to England completely cured of all their weaknesses; completely strengthened in their attachment to the Church of England; completely convinced of her superiority to her Roman rival, and of the grievous scandals and deadly mischiefs, the gross errors and abominable corruptions, the crying and glaring sins against God and man which the Church of Spain, through the influence of Popery, has to answer for.

The painfully correct words of an unhappy apostate form a striking and appropriate motto to this very interesting volume.

"Pleasant meadows, happy peasants, all holy monks, all holy priests, holy every body. Such charity, and such unity, when every man was a Catholic. I once believed in this Utopia myself, but when tested by stern facts, it all melts away like a dream."

The subject has been very beautifully treated by Mr. Edge in his "Vision of Peace." For our own parts, however, we are persuaded that by far the greater number of those who leave England for Rome have done so under a strong delusion, the direct result of demoniacal agency, under which they have fallen through some wilful and grievous sin against light and knowledge.

We call the worship of self, the mixing up vanity, and conceit, and headstrong perversity, and rebellious self-will with the secret mysteries of God, and the duties of the Christian ministry, a wilful and grievous sin against light and knowledge; and, that these characteristics belong to many of those who have gone over, no impartial person can for a moment deny.

We consider the dallying with practices, or even phrases which are in any degree corrupt, superstitious, erroneous, or idolatrous, to be a wilful and grievous sin against light and knowledge; if it be done to satisfy a craving after that which is forbidden, it

shows that the leprosy has already begun, and only waits time and tide to develop itself in all its deformity; if it be done in order to symbolize with a party, or to propitiate a party leader, it shows a preference of party to principle, of man to God; if it be done to outrage the feelings of others, or to separate those who do so from their fellow-churchmen, it adds the sin of uncharitableness to that of heresy. Now that such evil courses have been habitual with most of those who have left us, there cannot be the faintest shadow of doubt.

There is likewise another very grievous sin which forces itself upon our notice, we mean that of false-heartedness, which is the most heinous and perilous variety of that crime of which Satan is said to be in an especial manner the father. Catholic truth and Romish error are so utterly irreconcilable, so absolutely antagonistic to each other, that it is purely impossible for any man to profess the former, whilst holding the latter, without sacrificing his honesty and sinning against his own soul; and the process by which the change is carried on, and the means by which the compatibility of repugnant and irreconcilable tenets is defended within the recesses of the spirit, prepare and fashion the soul for the indwelling of the Evil One. The first attempts of this nature difficult and painful in the extreme—made in defiance of reason and conscience, and in actual despite of the Spirit of Grace—forfeit the offender's soul to its deadly foe, and account for all that follows.

It is under the strong delusion thus caused, that men form an utterly unreal idea—a fancy portrait of the Church of Rome—and then, after comparing it with the countenance of their own Spiritual Mother, which they have learned to view through the medium of a distorted vision, naturally decide in favour of the beautiful though imaginary enchantress.

As there are, however, many who are not yet too far gone, and many more who have not indeed tasted of the forbidden fruit, but who are liable to temptation in this matter; nay, as even in the case of those who have embarked already on the ill-omened voyage, which seldom finds a haven short of Rome, there are those who may be yet aroused to a sense of their peril through the mercy of God; we hail with delight a work which simply, though graphically, without prejudice and without partiality, describes things as they are at this present moment in that Church, which of all others has been, and is the staunchest supporter, and most submissive follower of the Church of Rome.

Let us proceed, then, to glean a few ears from the rich harvest at our disposal: we will begin with an early letter from Malaga:—

"The cathedral at Malaga is magnificent in point of size and height; it rises nobly above the city, with two lofty domes at the west façade, but only one dome finished; the other, like most things in Spain, is half done; in style it is every thing that is bad; immense Corinthian pillars, with ponderous cornices and ugly windows. As for the other churches they are mostly of brick outside, ugly and dirty inside. Their want of character is concealed by a profusion of bad gilding, and by the scantiness of light, which is let in through churchwardens' windows, veiled with red curtains, and their general effect, when lighted for a festival, is religious. They will not bear examining. On the high altar is a small crucifix, and in other parts of the church it is to be found on a larger scale, but the prominent object is the Virgin. Her images are various, and some of them most contemptible dolls; but the usual image represents her standing on the moon with twelve stars round her head, her dress of fair white lace, and over this, and covering also her head, a blue and silver cloak open in front. Another and very disagreeable image represents her suffering intensely for the pains of her Son, with a dagger in her breast, and her head on one side, a fashionable lace pocket-handkerchief in her hand. Her figures here in Spain are far more prominent than even in Italy."—p. 30.

The following passage is a striking exemplification of the mistakes which the unwary are liable to make, and the mode in which they are sometimes undeceived, exhibiting at one view the charming appearance, and the less attractive reality, giving, as it were, the transverse section of a whited sepulchre, and subjecting to the same *coup d'œil* its distinct strata—polished marble above, corruption and death below:—

"The cathedral, however, is not the fashionable church; for there are fashionable churches in Spain as well as in England. The church of *La Concepcion* is the fashionable church of Malaga. I went there in the afternoon, and I think I never saw a church full before, there being no pews, and few seats of any sort; it was full in every part. I only just looked in, and stood near the door for a few minutes, and on returning home expressed my wonder at the good behaviour of the people. 'In England,' I said, 'we must have had policemen:' when I put my hand into my pocket and found that my handkerchief was gone. A Mr. — and his servant, who were with me, had their pockets picked at the same time."—p. 31.

We suspect that much the same degree of disappointment attends many of those who, yielding to the snare of the fowler, become entangled in the meshes of Rome, and are taken captive at her will. Such would, at least, appear to be the teaching of the unhappy authoress of "*From Oxford to Rome*." At any rate, whether the victims are conscious of the robbery or not, it

is painfully certain, that those who yield to the vain allurements of delusive piety and external show, are, when they join the crowd of image-worshippers, despoiled of that pure gold which constitutes the true riches of the Catholic Christian.

The letter from which we have made these extracts, is dated December 19, 1849 ; we proceed to quote from one written three months later, March 22, 1850, when the writer had had further opportunities of judging for himself :—

“ Now I must give you my notion of the religious state of the people, founded on externals, for of internals I have not yet sufficient means of judging. I may as well say then, in one word, that I am thoroughly disappointed. I had expected much in ‘ Catholic Spain,’ which has not been fulfilled. The churches are in the worst possible style and taste. A person accustomed to our beautiful Gothic arches and windows, has little pleasure in the heavy Greek architecture and side chapels with tawdry gilding, and more tawdrily dressed images. The old religious houses are turned into barracks, and no one cares for it. It seems, from what I can learn, that the friars had lost all respect, nay, much worse, had done the greatest injury to religion. A Spanish gentleman said to me the other day, when I spoke of them,—‘ They made vows of chastity, and they were not chaste ; vows of poverty, and they were avaricious ; of humility, and they were proud ; they have deeply injured the faith of a religious people.’ Even now the character and tone of the great body of the priests is far from standing high. I have been much disappointed in the processions ; there is far too much talking, joking, and staring about, and that in the cathedral, for me to regard them as religious acts. Again, it was the pious custom at the evening bell, the *orationes*, for all to stop, take off their hats, and say an Ave Maria ; now you may hear the bell, and hardly three old men in the crowded Alameda take any notice. I cannot get over the strong shock to my feelings that the honours to the Blessed Virgin give me. I am sure the appearance of the churches would make any unprejudiced person think they were meant for her honour.”—p. 38.

This is wholesome though unpalatable truth for those who advocate the revival of monastic orders, and look with favourable eyes on the celibacy of the priesthood, who are always eloquent in descanting on the devotional character of Romanism, and deem it unjust as well as ungenerous to charge the churches of the Tridentine obedience with neglecting the worship of God for that of “ The Queen of Heaven.” On the latter point, the judicious compiler of this interesting work has added a pungent and valuable note :—

“ It is a pregnant fact,” says he, “ that in the district of Tinnevelly, while the converts of the English Church are called Christians, those of the Roman missionaries are termed Mother-worshippers. They of

Antioch did not give themselves the name of Christians, they called each other brethren and saints, but the title was attached to them from without, because Christ was the object of their worship. So they of Tinnevelly do not call themselves Mother-worshippers, but whereas the great object of their worship is the mother of our Lord, the name has similarly been imposed upon them."—p. 39.

We proceed to give further extracts illustrating the extent to which this worship is carried in Spain:—

"You have received my report," says J. M., in a letter dated Monday, April 25, 1850, "of the ceremonies of the Holy Week, and the general impression that they left upon my mind, which was, that the religion here was a hollow unreality, mere outside and spectacle, 'dry bones.' However, since that I have been present at a service which looks more like life and reality, at the little chapel of the Calvario. Just outside the city there is a steep hill so called, with a small chapel on the top, which is approached by a steep rough path, by the side of which are fourteen crosses for the fourteen stations. We went to the service there one Friday afternoon, and found a number of women ascending the hill, some with their shoes off, and saying prayers at the different stations; the chapel was full, but we just got in at the door. In the midst of the congregation, a priest was kneeling with his face to the altar, at a small table, on which was placed a cross and his book of prayers. These were all in Spanish, consisting, as it seemed to me, of Litanies well known to the people, Pater Nosters, and Ave Marias, which they all repeated after the priest, the whole presented the appearance of real devotion, instead of the idle gazing which I had begun to think universal. Then followed a sermon; the subject was our Lord's first speech from the cross. It was far the best I have heard, the most evangelical, enforcing on the people that penances and outward religious duties were serviceable to them only as tending to conversion of heart. It was also the most popish, *e. g.* the first example given of forgiveness was that of the Blessed Virgin; when the centurion pierced the side of our Lord, she came forward and bid him (the words were given) not to maltreat her Son; at the same time she so lovingly forgave him, that he was converted on the spot, and afterwards became a holy man: this is certain, for the Blessed Virgin revealed it herself to one of her servants. But still more, the sermon ended thus, 'Gloria al Padre, gloria al Hijo (the Son), gloria al Espíritu Santo, gloria á la Sacratísima Virgen.' This is to me very shocking, being a deliberate addition to the doxologies of the Church, putting the Blessed Virgin on an equality with the Holy Trinity: but these are daily words here."—p. 48.

This is more fully explained in a note which we subjoin:—

"The sermon concluded with an extempore prayer, which the people repeated after the preacher, which ended with the petition that we might all be brought at last to heaven, 'where with angels and archangels, and all blessed spirits, we shall join in the everlasting hymn of praise,

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts, all the whole heavens are full of Thy glory. Glory be to the Father, glory be to the Son, glory be to the Holy Ghost, glory be to the Most Sacred Virgin : Gloria al Padre, gloria al Hijo, gloria al Espíritu Santo, gloria á la Sacratísima Virgen, throughout all ages, for ever and ever. Amen.'"

The chapter concludes thus :—

"Again, we heard another sermon in the same place, where in the concluding prayer the preacher addressed *the Virgin* thus, 'Command the clouds that they give rain, lest the harvest perish, and *thy* people come to misery, and the children ask for bread and there be none to give them.' I am very glad to know the practical working of the Church in 'Catholic' Spain, especially at a time when minds are so unsettled at home."—p. 49.

It is of course very easy to explain all this away, and to satisfy those who are determined to be satisfied.

"For when to sin our biass'd nature leans,
The careful devil is still at hand with means."

So it is now quite easy for a philosophic Brahmin or Buddhist to resolve the errors and idolatries of his religion into a strictly pure, though highly symbolical, theism. So it was of old time for the idolaters of Greece and Rome, of Egypt and Canaan, to prove to demonstration, that, when rightly understood, their abominations in theory and practice were merely the outward vehicles or visible manifestations of a deeply spiritual worship of the one true God.

It would be easy to prove in like manner that Barrington was the most honest and Greenacre the most amiable of men. We see the thing done over and over again at the Old Bailey. Nay, to go a step further, it is quite competent for one desirous of doing so, to deceive others, ay, and himself too, into the belief, that Ferdinand of Naples is the loving father of his people, and Louis Napoleon the disinterested preserver of his country ; that Gladstone is a man of unchanging principles, and Horsman an example of exalted piety ; that Lord John Russell is bold, but not insidious ; and that the Romanizing party in our Church is sincerely desirous for the revival of Convocation.

There is, in fact, nothing, however clearly contrary to reason and to fact, however monstrous, preposterous, or absurd, for which a case cannot be got up and a verdict obtained, where judge and jury have pre-determined to arrive at a particular conclusion.

But let us proceed with the subject of Spanish Mariolatry.

"I have collected," says F. M., in a letter of 26th March, 1851, "the popular theory about the Blessed Virgin, and when I call it popular, I

do not mean that it is formed of individual fancies like popular Protestantism, but that it is what the Church teaches in sermons and authorized books of devotion, so that people must receive that or nothing. They believe,

"1. That the Blessed Virgin was conceived without sin, and continued so.

"2. That she suffered as much as our Lord, and that she would have died for us, but her sufferings already were as great as if she had died.

"3. That her sufferings were meritorious, and enough to make amends for all the sins of men and angels.

"4. That standing at the foot of the cross she offered her Son for the redemption of the world.

"5. That when our Lord said, 'Behold thy son,' He gave not St. John only, but the whole human race to her for sons, and her to us for a mother; so that henceforth we can receive nothing good but through her hands.

"6. That when He went into heaven, He left her to be the guide and director of his Church, and the teacher of the Apostles.

"7. That when He took her up into heaven, He crowned her Queen and Lady of heaven and earth."

"In addition to this, they dwell very much on her gentleness and kindness as our Mediator, and say that sinners may well fear to approach our Lord, but none can fear to come to so kind, so tender, and so loving a mother. Almost all the prayers at the mission were addressed to her. You will see that the fourth, the second, the third, and the sixth of the things that I have mentioned, attribute to her what we are accustomed to consider as the especial work of the Holy Trinity in our redemption. In theory they seem to put her more in the place of the Third Person, in practice in that of the Second.

"I am very glad," ingenuously proceeds the same writer, "to have seen and heard all these things, for the state of England at present must be a great trial; and though it is poor comfort to think that others are worse, yet, being sure of the promise that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church, it is a comfort and encouragement to be persuaded that our own branch is the best. I remember the time when I had a secret feeling, that the Roman Catholics were better off than we; now I rejoice daily that my lot has been appointed in the Anglican branch."—pp. 217—219.

The extent to which this dissatisfaction has extended, and still extends, is probably little estimated even by those who are most jealous in the matter. Nay, we believe that many, very many, are not aware of the real state of their thoughts and feelings on the subject, whilst others who are conscious of them are blind to the danger of entertaining and the sin of encouraging them. We shall recur to the subject in its turn, and proceed now with some further illustrations of "*Mother-worship*." Under the date, Seville, April 11, 1851, we find—

“The following are extracts from a sermon preached this morning in Seville Cathedral, on ‘Viernes de los Dolores.’

“‘She weepeth sore in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks.’—Lam. i. 2.

“‘Sad and greatly to be wept was the desolation of Jerusalem, the queen of cities, &c. . . . But how far more worthy of tears was that of which the desolation of Jerusalem was but a faint type, that to which the whole book of the Lamentations refers, the sorrows of Mary, the Queen of Angels and of the blessed spirits!

“‘Ave Maria!

“‘The sorrows of Mary were the greatest in the world. St. Jerome says, that in proportion to the greatness of the love is the greatness of the sorrow. Her love to her Son was the greatest that ever was, therefore her sorrow was the greatest. Great was the sorrow of Reuben for Joseph, and that of David for Jonathan, but their love and their sorrow, were small compared with hers, &c. . . . She was not like Deborah sitting under the palm tree, and sending Barak to the fight, but like the same Deborah going with him to the battle. Not like Hagar, going apart from her son that she might not see him die: she looked with a stedfast eye on the sufferings of her Beloved. From the time that He was born she knew all that would befall Him, all of his sufferings were ever present to her mind. What must she have felt when she looked upon those innocent hands and feet, and knew that they were to be pierced upon the cross; when she beheld his fair hair which was to be full of blood? &c. . . . And yet, from her free love and charity for the human race, she willed to offer Him up. The sufferings of Mary were so great, that if they were divided amongst all the creatures in the world, they would suffice to destroy the existence of all. God, who sent an angel to comfort his Son in his agony, sustained her with his arm, that she might not perish through her sufferings. Her sufferings differed from those of the martyrs, not only in being more intense, but because they suffered for the salvation of their own souls. She, who was without spot or stain, purely through charity, that she might be the redeemer of the human race. The martyrs, in their torments, were often supported by consolations from God, which made their bodily pains appear light to them. She was utterly without it. . . . Under the law there were two altars near together, that of burnt offering and that of incense; from the one were heard the groans of slaughtered victims, from the other the voice of praise. The first symbolized the cross whereon Jesus was offered, the second the heart of Mary. . . . I will say with St. Bonaventure, that all that Jesus suffered in all the various parts of his body, all these sufferings were gathered together in one in the heart of Mary.’”—pp. 229—231.

It is clear, then, that the practical working of the Church of Spain is to deprave the cardinal truths of Christianity—the Catholic doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Atonement—by giving to another the honour of Him who is emphatically a

jealous God—by denying the natural humanity of the mother of Jesus—and by giving to her sufferings an expiatory virtue, and to herself a mediatorial power.

Well might the Mohammedan poet Ibn Shoheyd describe the services in the Church of Santa Maria at Cordova, in the following terms :—

“ The noise of thundering bells resounded in my ears, the glare of innumerable lamps dazzled my eyes ; the priests decked in rich silken robes of gay and fanciful colours, girt by girdle cords, advanced. Every one of those present had banished mirth from their countenances, and expelled from their minds all agreeable ideas ; and if they directed their steps towards the marble font, it was merely to take sips of water in the hollow of the hand. By the Lord of mercy, it was to a girl that their prayers were addressed, it was for her that they put on the gay tunics, instead of humiliating themselves before the Almighty ! ”—p. 324, note.

We are aware that the judgment, or even the testimony, of an infidel in such a matter, will be by many persons at once thrown over as valueless and inadmissible ; and yet, it is difficult to point out what evidence is admissible, if Protestant and Papist are to be set aside as interested parties, and unbeliever and misbeliever denied a hearing altogether.

What appears more to the point, is, that our blessed Lord and his Apostles more than once refer to those without as judges of matters within the Church, and that expressly on the subject of what are termed the Notes of the Church.

Milner, the celebrated Roman controversialist, puts this matter in a clear light :—

“ Thus,” says he, “ we Catholics, when we are asked, *Which are the marks of the true Church ?* point out certain exterior, visible marks, such as plain unlearned persons can discover, if they will take ordinary pains for this purpose, no less than persons of the greatest abilities and literature.”

The sanctity here required as a sign is exterior and visible, not interior and invisible, and it is to be judged of according to certain acknowledged principles—admitted to be of Divine authority and unreserved obligation both by ourselves and those to whom we appeal. Such a code or measure is furnished by the Ten Commandments, which are received by Jews and Mohammedans as well as Romanists and Anglicans. Now, what is the judgment arrived at on this point by an intelligent Mussulman ?—

“ *By the Lord of mercy, it was to a GIRL that their prayers were addressed, it was for HER they put on the gay tunics, INSTEAD OF HUMILIATING THEMSELVES BEFORE THE ALMIGHTY !* ”

If, however, it be urged, that the distinctive tenets and peculiar prejudices of the Moslem make them unsuitable referees in the matter, we can cite the ultroneous testimony of one whose sympathies are entirely with the Tridentine Churches on this matter. The present Emperor of China, who is totally free from any taint of the Protestant or Iconoclastic leaven, in his late edict giving universal toleration to all professing Christians, expressly extends his imperial clemency "both to those who worship images, and those who do not."

And here, that we have mentioned the word images, we would remark that the adoration paid by these "Mother-worshippers" is not exclusively given to the invisible being whom they designate as the Mother of our Lord, but is also shared by the various images which represent that being. Why otherwise should one image be revered more than another?

Under the head of Granada we find the following :—

"The image of our Lady de las Angustias is one that is much revered, kept in a church dedicated to the Blessed Virgin under the same title. 'Can you not stay till after Easter Tuesday, Señor?' 'No, I cannot; but what reason is there for my staying?' 'Oh! it is a great pity, Señor. It is the day, this year, on which Nuestra Señora de las Angustias is to go in procession from her own church to visit the cathedral.' 'Is this image of our Lady thought very highly of?' 'Sí Señor. I was told by ——— and ——— that some years ago, when the Carlists were in the ascendant, as it was being carried to the cathedral, some of the more extreme cried out frequently, *Viva la Santísima Maria y muerte á todos los Dios!*' 'Did you hear that yourself?' 'No, Señor, I was not present; but many repeated it, and I have no doubt of it.' 'And what did the exclamation really mean? It could not bear the signification that at first sight it seemed to bear.' 'Ah! not so much *muerte*, death, as, give us the most holy Mary de las Angustias, and we want neither thing nor person more.'"—p. 309.

If this is not blasphemy we do not know what is. It may be answered, that this as well as the ribald oath, *Sacre mon dieu*, are only modes of expression :—granted; BUT, we are strangely mistaken if it is not one of the modes of expression contemplated by the Third Commandment; for, "by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned."

Such, then, is the practical working of the Church of Spain; for the Carlists are her most faithful children and full exponents; first to give to another the honour of our Creator and the office of our Redeemer, and then to turn round and blaspheme the Holy One of Israel.

The following incident, which took place at Seville, on Good Friday, 1851, whilst tending to support the allegation that the

creature-worship, of which those subjected to Roman teaching are undoubtedly guilty, degenerates frequently into image worship,—i. e. that the image itself is adored as well as the invisible being whom it represents,—strongly reminds one of the state of Egyptian idolatry in the second century as described by Juvenal, and shows in a strong light the analogy between popery and paganism :—

“One procession bearing the images of our Lord falling with the Cross, and of our Lady of Hope, fell in with another bearing those of the Conversion of the Penitent Thief, and of our Lady of Monserrat, and they fought for the precedence. The former gained it, but the fight occasioned a panic in the great square, where there were, it is supposed, 20,000 persons. The brotherhood of the Conversion and of our Lady of Monserrat, wearing high caps with flaps over the face that blinded them, and long trains that entangled their feet, were quite helpless in the confusion, and went down, I was told by an American, ‘like nine-pins.’”—p. 225.

“At Alhaurin,” adds Mr. Meyrick in a note, “there are usually two processions, commonly called ‘Jesus arriba’ (Jesus above) and ‘Jesus abajo’ (Jesus below), one for the upper and the other for the lower part of the town. When they meet they generally fight, and if any unfortunate woman, wearing the ribbons which are the badge of one party, falls into the hands of the other party, they are torn off by force.”

We have delayed thus long upon Mariolatry, because it is beyond all others the distinguishing tenet and practice of the Roman Church; it is that tenet and practice which separates her most clearly and openly from the Church of the Fathers, as well as from the Church of England, which is most directly and offensively opposed to the letter and spirit of the written word, and equally so to “the faith once for all delivered to the saints;” and whereas in other matters the Papal See and its partisans are content to defend, as best they may, with more or less zeal and vehemence, the mass of corruption which had accumulated up to the time of the Reformation; in *this* matter, the adherents of the Tridentine Pseudo-Synod have proceeded yet more fully and fondly to augment and develop the evil inheritance derived from their fathers.

It is strange, indeed, that since the tremendous scourge of the French Revolution has been removed, the votaries of this worship have vied with each other in the earnestness, the infatuation, the madness of their devotion; reminding one strangely of their predecessors, who, when the mournful prophet urged them after the destruction of Jerusalem to abandon their superstitions and idolatrous practices, replied :—

“As for the words that thou hast spoken unto us in the name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee, but we will certainly do whatsoever thing goeth forth out of our mouth, to burn incense unto the Queen of Heaven, and to pour out drink offerings unto her, as we have done, we and our fathers, our kings and our princes, in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem: for then had we plenty of victuals, and were well, and saw no evil.”

Mariolatry was, however, not the only blemish which Mr. Meyrick's friends discovered in the religion of “Catholic” Spain. Not only did they find this and other evils from which the Church of England is, by the confession and *accusation* of her opponents, entirely free; but they also found many of the very same defects, real or imaginary, which perplex the minds of weak or wavering members of the Anglican Communion. For our own part, we have no patience with such perplexity: we consider that there are only two grounds which can justify any man for leaving that religious community in which he has been educated, and which therefore has a *prima facie* claim to his allegiance: viz.—

1. That he cannot remain a member of such community without saying or doing something which is clearly and absolutely incompatible with his salvation, or at any rate manifestly forbidden by the written Word of God.

2. That he cannot whilst remaining a member of such community fulfil in their entirety the terms of the covenant offered by God to man; or, in other words, that he cannot in such community obtain with full assurance the covenanted mercy of God.

These are reasons, substantial, tangible reasons for leaving one community of professing Christians for another. We need not point out their direct bearing upon the claims of the Anglo-catholic Churches.

The man who leaves the communion of England for that of Rome, or who deserts the shadow of our holy Mother for any of the many other sects with which she is assailed, is in our opinion guilty of grievous sin: but the man who does so upon any other ground than those which we have stated, is chargeable with gross folly as well as with an awfully increased amount of guilt.

We can understand a man going to Rome because he believes her to be the only Church, without whose pale there is no salvation; we can pity such an one, and lament over him as one who has been grievously but logically deluded to his destruction. But when we hear of a pervert leaving us because his mind is perplexed by the Gorham or the Hampden case, or because he imagines that Rome offers greater facilities for the cultivation of

the soul than England, or because such and such a man has already gone over, or because its rites and ceremonies, or any other of its properties or accidents accord with his feelings or his fancies, his tastes or his prejudices, we own to an unmitigated and unalloyed indignation.

To desert or deny our Mother because she is subjected to sorrow and suffering, to captivity and humiliation, resembles indeed the conduct of the Apostles on Mount Olivet, and of Peter in the house of Caiaphas; but has no other warranty in the words of Scripture or the practice of primitive antiquity. Neither is the case of such men strengthened by the further indictment that the bearing of their spiritual Mother under ignominy and oppression resembles that of Him, concerning whom it was said:—"He was oppressed, and he was afflicted; yet he opened not his mouth: he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth."

To roam in search of spiritual food from the pastures prepared for us by the good Shepherd, and in the ardour of our keen and restless and all-absorbing selfishness to prefer the possible exaltation of our own soul to the positive glory and command of God, is to bring ourselves under the operation of that fearful sentence—"Whosoever shall seek to save his life shall lose it."

For, whoever having been taught from his youth up those Scriptures, which are able to make us wise unto salvation, and educated in the doctrine and discipline of the English Church, consents, for the sake of what he imagines to be greater spiritual advantages, to commit what he knows, or has known to be, direct infractions of God's commandments, and direct insults to the majesty of Him who giveth not His glory to another, is, whilst seeking to save his soul, bringing it under surer condemnation.

To leave a religious community, because we are fully convinced (after diligent, and humble, and earnest prayer, and the honest use of all the means of arriving at a correct conclusion on the point), that our remaining in it, either is in itself, or necessarily involves the commission of sin; or, because it is without one or both of the sacraments of the Gospel, is a tangible and intelligible ground for secession. But to leave that position which Providence has apparently allotted us, to desert that body which claims our allegiance by right divine, simply because we are displeased or dissatisfied at home, and think we should or might be better off elsewhere, is as contemptible in a rational, as it is unpardonable in a moral point of view.

A child who leaves its parents' roof to seek another protector, because he has not bread to eat, is excusable; one who flees away to avoid being instrumental in theft, or subjected to prostitution, deserves all praise; but the child that elopes with the sole view of having some toys and indulgences, which it could not obtain at home, deserves not only stern reproof, but the severest chastisement.

And this reminds us of what appears to be a great omission. Those persons who have left the English Church for the Romish schism, the Catholic faith for the popish heresy, ought to have been formally excommunicated. The effect of such a proceeding would, we think, have been incalculably beneficial.

It is very remarkable, quite curious to see, how the very identical scandals, real or imaginary, which shock a certain class of minds so much in England, exist in a far more flagrant form in Spain.

Let us begin with the Hampden case; and here we shall quote Mr. Meyrick's facts and arguments, without any attempt to curtail his admirable discussion of the matter:—

"In order to explain my correspondent's statement, concerning the Esparteran bishops¹, it may be of use to put together a few facts, gathered from no hostile witness, an article in the 'Dublin Review,' the writer of which, as he speaks of the early impressions and recollections of childhood in Spain, may be presumed to be Cardinal Wiseman. When a see becomes vacant, 'the Catholic Church has most minutely provided for its wants, by vesting in the dean and chapter the power and duty of naming a vicar capitular, with jurisdiction over the diocese, *sede vacante*.' The Bishop of Malaga died. 'We will not enter into particulars respecting the first intrusion by the Government of a vicar capitular, further than to say that he was a canon of the cathedral, as the canon law requires, and had at least that qualification more than his successor, of whom principally we have to speak, but that he was a man of suspicious orthodoxy, and lax principles. His name was Manuel Ventura Gomez. He was educated in the suppressed University of Baeza, into which the works of Fabronius and the doctrines of Pistoja had too fatally penetrated; and he clearly had brought away his share of them. He was afterwards obliged to leave the kingdom for his revolutionary doctrines, and came to England, where his name will be found figuring in the reports of the Bible Society, of which he became an active member.' In the spring of 1837, he vacated his office, having been nominated by the Government to the vacant see of Jaen. Upon his resignation, the chapter elected their dean as vicar capitular. 'We believe we are not wrong in

¹ Viz. "You may be aware that when Espartero was in power, the Pope refused to approve his nominations to bishoprics. He refused to name others, and so in, I think, thirty dioceses, they were without bishops."—p. 122.

stating, that, owing to his having acted according to the laws of the Church, relative to the ordination of a young ecclesiastic, he was banished beyond the seas.'

" 'To him succeeded the person whom the Government had thought proper to name as Bishop Elect of Malaga, Dr. Valentine Ortigosa, Archdeacon of Carmona, and, as such, Dignitary of the Cathedral of Seville. He seems in youth to have had his orthodoxy tried, and found wanting; for he was brought up for trial before the Inquisition. He was an active partisan of Government, and engaged under it when he was named Bishop Elect of Malaga by the ministry, which he had served. Government, regardless of the canon law, which forbids a bishop elect to be vicar capitular, and enjoins that he should be one of the chapter, acted upon the plan of recommending to chapters (*sede vacante*) to choose for vicars the very persons whom it had named for future bishops over them. This was the case with regard to Ortigosa. By a royal order, dated October 7, 1836, the chapter was *recommended* to appoint him its vicar.' The royal *recommendation* was obeyed, 'the chapter unfortunately yielding to the dictation of power,' and nominating him their vicar. 'Here is, indeed, a good specimen of the freedom left to the Church for the discharge of her most important functions by the pretended champions of that cause.'

" Very soon after his arrival at Malaga, he put forth an address to the chapter, characterized by 'the most extraordinary arrogance, and the most startling Jansenism. Papal enactments are to him as so much waste paper; and he asserts the doctrine which pervades all his other writings, that bishops receive their authority in its fulness from the Church, by mere election or presentation, without confirmation from the holy see. So that presentation by a *lay sovereign* is enough to communicate the plenitude of apostolic power, and of ecclesiastical jurisdiction! The bishop elect immediately appealed' against a remonstrance of his chapter 'to the civil authorities: the chapter were thus compelled to throw themselves under the protection of the Crown.' (This, I presume, means, that both parties alike appealed to the civil power.) 'As usual, might triumphed over right.'

" The next circumstance that brought out Ortigosa's character was the following:—A Franciscan monk, of the name of Fernandez, had applied to Ventura Gomez, when he was vicar, for relief from his vows of chastity, on the grounds that he was not of sufficient age when he took the vows, the certificate of baptism produced at his profession being not his, but that of a brother who had died, and that he had not acted from free choice, but under fear and compulsion of his brother, already in the order. He therefore prayed Gomez to interfere in his behalf, on the grounds, 'that dispensation from vows belonged essentially to the Episcopal jurisdiction, because it belonged originally to the Apostles, the fulness of whose authority every bishop inherited, and that it was only through the false decretals of Isidore, and the dark ignorance of the middle ages, that the power was reserved to the Apostolic See.' Gomez decided in his favour, and declared his reli-

gious vows null. The dean, who next succeeded as vicar, reversed his predecessor's judgment. Then followed Ortigosa, and the Franciscan renewed his petition to him. 'The result was a long decision from the vicar, dated Jan. 22, 1838, in which, in a bold and open tone of defiance, he strips the sovereign pontiff of his acknowledged rights, and out-Herods Herod, going beyond even the worst disciples of the perfidious school of Jansenism. The bull, *Auctorem Fidei*, to whose censures he exposes himself in almost every paragraph, he seems to treat with perfect contempt, and riding over every barrier which general councils, popes, or the very constitution of Christ's Church have placed against schismatical independence of particular bishops, and acting further on the clearly false principle, that a bishop elect has all the power of the Apostles themselves, he pronounces the vows invalid, grants the required dispensation, and orders the curate of Casarabonda to marry the apostate. And not so content, he commands this insulting and heretical document to be read at the offertory of the public mass in that place.'

"His third offence, which 'brought out the poison of Ortigosa's evil principles still more palpably,' was an address to his chapter, 'as full of arrogance and heresy as such a document could well be,' which arrogance and heresy seem to be contained in the following sentences: 'Penetrated with the thought of what the episcopacy is, and of the degradation to which it has been brought down by the misfortune of our times, and having made a profound study of the authentic monuments of the primitive Church,—monuments quite forgotten and unknown by the majority of people,—and possessed, moreover, by an ardent desire to labour for the restoration of its high privileges, now that important circumstances of great future interest to the poor Church of Spain, so critically situated, require it, I feel myself impelled to enter into this discussion, that so we may enlighten one another, not being swayed by the spirit of either the Ultramontane or the Cisalpine school, by impractical philosophical Jansenism, by abominable gross and hypocritical Jesuitism.'

"In the spring of 1838, 'as Ortigosa in all these matters had not sought concealment, but had made his uncatholic notions ostentatiously public, the chapter could no longer permit the *scandal* to continue. Recourse to Rome was impossible; and therefore the canonical step of denouncing his writings to the metropolitan, the Archbishop of Seville, as unorthodox, and putting him upon his trial, was adopted . . . The *minister of grace and justice* directed him to proceed to Seville,' which, accordingly, but not till the following spring of 1839, he did, 'having in the preceding autumn addressed a pastoral to the clergy and laity of the diocese, in which he pathetically told them, that he was going in obedience to the order of Government,' 'which is paramount.' On his arrival at Seville, 'he threw himself behind the shield of the State, and appealed to the civil power to rescue him from the ecclesiastical tribunal. The civil power, anxious at once to serve and save its own child and faithful partisan,' interposed its authority, forbade all pr -

ceedings, and added a severe reprimand. 'This order,' continues the Dublin Review, 'which was issued on the 24th of April, 1839, excited the astonishment and indignation of all sensible persons in Spain, and led to the perplexing conclusion, that in Catholic constitutional Spain there was no longer any authority competent to examine into the orthodoxy of a public ecclesiastical teacher.' . . . 'By the aid of the civil power he rode triumphant over the necks of all.'

"On the 1st of March, 1841, Gregory XVI., 'that sovereign pontiff, whose energetic voice had made a Ferdinand and a Nicholas writhe on their royal and imperial thrones,' delivered an address to his cardinals in a private consistory, upon the conduct of Ortigosa. 'To this, Ortigosa replied, in a tone of insult, which we believe has never been equalled since the days of Luther. He affects to believe that it must be a forgery, pretends to distinguish what are the Pope's sentiments on it, from what have been put into his mouth by treacherous compilers, extorted, as he repeatedly says, from his venerable old age, abusing the venerable name of the sovereign pontiff; accuses him of oppression and injustice against the humblest of priests, and cites him to answer for his allocution before the judgment-seat of God. For this insolence he was *well chastised* in many publications, several of which we have had occasion to cite, as well as in *loose sheets* and *newspaper articles* now before us.'

"Ortigosa seems to have retained his position as vicar capitular and bishop elect till the overthrow of Espartero's government. With the new Government there came in new principles of dealing with the Church, and Espartero's nominees were no longer supported. Ortigosa retired to Madrid, where, in 1845, he was still living. 'The course pursued by the present moderate party,' in 1845, says the Dublin Review, 'presents a gratifying contrast with that of their predecessors. It has consisted in refraining from all actual interference, but advising, or at least freely permitting, the parties to follow the line of conduct which duty and conscience suggested.'

"The case of Ortigosa is not singular. 'In several instances,' continues the reviewer, 'the Government has thrust into vacant sees persons wholly unfit by character, and has either extorted the consent of the chapter, so as to render the election doubtful, or forced upon them a choice, *ipso facto* null by common law.' Thus Señor Valleja and Señor Gonfalguer were uncanonically elected by the chapter at the instance of Government to the post of vicar capitulars in the metropolitan see. 'When the pressure of the regent's government was removed. . . . Gonfalguer resigned, and left the chapter at liberty to make new and canonical arrangements,' after being eight years uncanonically in office. In the diocese of Guadix, 'the civil governor of the province thought proper to order a protest or manifesto against the Pope's allocution of March 1, 1840, to be read in all the churches on their successive festivals.' On the vicar's opposing it, he was banished for four years; and, I presume, the protest was read. In the diocese of Osma, Campuzano had been illegally promoted. On the overthrow

of Espartero, and a hint from the minister of grace and justice, 'that it would be gratifying to her majesty the queen,' he resigned; 'and thus the chapter was left to the free and unbiassed exercise of its rights in a new election.'

"Now in this whole affair the conduct of the Government was clearly iniquitous, and Ortigosa may have been a heretic; certainly in a Romanist's acceptation of the term he was. I have no desire to defend one or the other. But there is one thing which forces itself very strongly on the mind on the consideration of these facts, namely, that there is a parallelism between them and some events which have happened among ourselves, which ought to have stopped the mouths of those who were most loud-voiced on the subject of the election to the see of Hereford, and the question of confirmation of bishops. An heretical archdeacon and cathedral dignitary is, on the recommendation of the civil power, invested by the due ecclesiastical instruments with episcopal jurisdiction, which jurisdiction was to continue till the see (to which he was himself nominated) was filled up, and did last till his patron the prime minister went out of office. On the other side, a professor of divinity, who was not heretical, but who had, in the opinion of most sound members of the Church, put forth certain unorthodox statements at one period of his life, is on the like recommendation elected by the like body as their bishop, and consecrated by the metropolitan. Again, England has been ringing (and may it continue to ring till the wrong is redressed) with the injustice and absurdity of there being, according to one interpretation put upon the law, no means of testing the orthodoxy and fitness of priests recommended by the Crown to be elected and consecrated bishops. Yet in Catholic Spain the tyrannous interference of the civil power led alike to 'the conclusion, that there was no longer any authority competent to examine into the orthodoxy of a public ecclesiastical teacher.' What should we think of Spaniards, who, owing to these and like scandals, had taken to turning Greeks? If we refuse to discern in these circumstances any notes of uncatholicity in the Church of Spain, how can we, as logical thinkers, or honest-hearted men, make the shadow of their counterpart a note, much more as some have done, a damning proof, against the Catholicity of the Church of England?"—pp. 123—133.

Many of our readers have, no doubt, shared that constant regret and frequent indignation which we experience at the distinctions sanctioned by some of our clergy and observable in many of our churches between the richer and poorer members of the body of Christ. That any difference whatever should exist in the ministration of church ordinances or the allotment of church accommodation between rich and poor, is plainly unchristian.

It is a point, too, on which Romanists are wont to taunt us whilst parading their own superiority in the matter; and that, in *some cases*, their conduct in this respect is worthy of praise and

admiration and imitation, we readily grant; for we are ready to acknowledge any tokens of the Divine presence wherever we find it, and to appreciate and adopt any thing that is really laudable and advisable by whomsoever it be practised.

It will be seen, however, from the following passage, that as far as the rites of burial go, the poor, even after both their bodies and souls have been equalized by the hand of the great Leveller with those of their wealthier brethren, do not receive that respect which we should naturally expect would be their guerdon in a Church which makes such high pretensions to absolute and undeviating catholicity.

“We have before given you some account of the funerals of the rich, I will now describe to you a burial that I witnessed of one of the poor. We had not been many days in Seville, and I was wandering out in the evening towards the old Alameda, when I heard the sound of a voice in one of the churches, and went in; it was a funeral service; below the altar steps upon the ground was placed an ordinary looking coffin, and in the *coro* at the west end, a priest with two attendants was reciting the Psalms, there were about eight persons present besides myself, and I sat myself down on a bench, and tried to follow the service. Presently the priest left the *coro*, and advanced to the coffin, which was opened by one of the attendants, for it did not nail down as ours do, but opened like a box with a hinge; and taking the aspersorium, sprinkled the corpse within with holy water; it was the body of a woman of middle age, of the lower class, and laid out, not as our dead are, but in her ordinary daily dress; the coffin was then closed, the service ceased, and the priest and his attendants retired.

“Two of the men then advanced, and lifted the coffin on their shoulders, and carried it quickly out of the church, followed by five others and by myself. They walked at a quick pace, without any order or regularity, through the numerous streets, sometimes on the pavement, and sometimes in the middle of the street; no one paying any attention to them, or moving out of the way: once the attendants stopped, it was to light their cigarrets, and then they proceeded as before. At last we reached the gate of the city, outside of which is a large flat meadow, and at the further end the *Campo Santo*. There was a review of cavalry going on in the meadow, and while the bearers of the corpse walked round by the road, the followers made a short cut across the meadow, and stopped awhile to see the review; at length, seeing the corpse nearly arrived, they hurried on, and joined it at the gate.

“The *Campo Santo* here is rather more untidy than that at Malaga, but in all material respects much the same; a large square space surrounded with four high walls, in the width of which are the niches for the dead, rising in tiers one above another; the centre space all coarse broken ground, and overgrown with nettles. We passed through the

first court into a second, and there I expected to see the coffin placed in one of the niches, and walled in: but no, there was a wide shallow trench running all across this interior square, which seemed to be filled up about half way: a couple of men were beckoned to the spot, who came with their hoes, and hacked out a little place about a foot deep in the loose ground: the coffin was then opened, and the body taken out, and laid in the hole. The sexton took the pillow that had laid under its head, and tore it into rags, and spread it over the face of the corpse, while his companions threw a few baskets-full of earth, and then he jumped down himself and trod it in. I had stood close by, and watched the whole proceeding up to this point with a kind of creeping horror; but now I could bear it no more, it was literally treading on the corpse's face. I turned away and left, and the others followed me. I had been present the whole time; I heard no voice of prayer, and saw no sign of it, except that for a moment, as the corpse was laid in the ground, the attendants took off their hats. And this, said I to myself, as I walked slowly home, and watched the evening shadows coming over the meadow, this is the burial of Christ's poor in Catholic Spain. Again and again in the night I woke with the thought of the man ruthlessly trampling upon that pale still face."—pp. 239—242.

We condemn and justly the pew-system as at present prevalent in many parts of England, and feel frequently indignant at the offensive precedence given in some of our sacred structures to rank and wealth. In the cathedral at Seville, however, we find that the Infanta and the Duke of Montpensier "have a grand seat placed for them within the altar rails, below the steps on the north side," upon which Mr. Meyrick very justly remarks, "Why is there nothing wrong in this in Spain, if it would be Erastianism in England? Why would it be Erastianism in England, if there is nothing wrong in it in Spain?"—p. 236.

There are, however, green spots in the desert, and wild flowers spring here and there amid the waste; there are features in the Spanish church, traits in the Spanish character, which it were wrong to ignore, and to which we gladly accord that high meed of praise which they deserve; for conscious are we, that the good cause can never be advanced by any word or deed of unfairness or injustice; that there is folly as well as wickedness in withholding approbation wherever it is deserved; and that they who would excel all should be ready to learn from all.

We submit the following to those political economists who have not yet arrived at the conclusion, that Christianity is incompatible with an enlightened administration, and that the duty of those who legislate for this life, is to ignore the existence of another:—

"There is a sort of large workhouse in this place, supported by voluntary contributions; it is called the *Casa de Mendicidad, de Socorro, y de Maternidad*. The *Mendicidad* department is for obsti-

nate and notorious beggars, who are taken there by the police ; the *Socorro*, for any poor who like to enter it voluntarily ; the *Maternidad*, for foundlings or orphans, or for any children whose parents like to send them there. We got an order to see it one day, and found the departments of the poor and the boys much as one would expect, the boys learning just as boys do in an English Dame school ; but when we got to the babies and girls, the change was delightful. There are four Sisters of Mercy, they belong to the order of St. Vincent de Paul ; the head-quarters of the sisterhood are at Madrid, but on an application being made for sisters, four were sent here. They attend to the babies, teach the girls, and go out to nurse the sick. The mother is a very fine-looking woman, she must have been beautiful. She told me that they had as many as 400 babies brought in in the course of the year : they come of course from the very dregs of the people ; generally speaking, they have wretched constitutions, and half of them die. I saw some of the very young ones, poor little puny things, whose days seemed numbered. We asked what became of the survivors, and were surprised to hear that two-thirds of them are adopted. The sisters get nurses for them in the house, and put some out to nurse in the villages round, and the nurses get so attached to them that they cannot part with them. If they wish to adopt them they are allowed, but told that they may at any time send them back. I have heard from other people, that the nurses say it is a miracle of St. Joseph's, the patron of foundlings and orphans, he makes them love these children more than their own. It was quite delightful to see the terms on which the sisters and the children were, the respect, entirely devoid of fear, that the latter have. The sisters hear mass in their oratory every morning, and the girls are all allowed to be present. Unfortunately there was but one lady in the party besides me, and she knew no Spanish, so I could not learn half the particulars that I wanted ; but the difference between this and that form of corruption, an English workhouse, struck me. I know an English child of only six, who has learnt such evil habits in a workhouse, and become so rooted in them, that if she had remained there a year longer, I should say she must have been ruined for life. These Spanish children, when they grow up, go out into service ; the sisters let them go to any respectable family, but on condition that they are not to be sent on to other services, but if their mistresses do not like them, they are to be sent back to them. If any of them wish to remain and become sisters, and show a fit disposition for it, they may do so ; but I believe the general end is, they go into service and marry."—pp. 14—16.

This is, indeed, a delightful picture, and one which we should do well to consider.

Again we read, p. 216,—

"Spanish *franqueza* is very pleasant to a stranger."

Again, at pp. 55, 56 :—

"There is a custom that I like very much. Every servant in the

house on seeing you first says, 'Good morning!' and in the evening, 'Good night!'"

Again, at p. 23:—

"We get up every morning at six, and walk on the mountains; and there we meet genuine Andalusian peasants, every one of whom is a gentleman by nature and feeling. Many an Englishman of birth and education might learn from them."

Nor does there seem to be so much of that petty jealousy of the accomplishments of the poorer classes, which, though rapidly fading from view, is not yet extinct amongst the wealthier orders in England; for we are told, at p. 164, that "music and dancing" are "learnt by labourers' daughters, as well" as by those in a higher social position: and at p. 120, after describing a truly delightful scene amongst the peasantry, that "the children of labourers regularly learn of a master to dance the fandango," a course which naturally tends to humanize the character of the working classes, and render them less discontented with their situation.

All these things are worthy of commendation; but they are assuredly not to be weighed in the balance against the vast mass of guilt, which we have already shown to be part and parcel of the practical working of the Church of Spain.

We might go on to any length in the same strain; for the valuable work before us furnishes ample materials. We will bring, however, our article now to a conclusion, merely alluding to the desecration of the Lord's day, apparently so universal in the unhappy country under consideration; the small value set on human life, and the number of murders which are perpetrated, without being punished; the false position occupied by the women, especially in the higher classes, who receive none of that heartfelt respect and rational liberty which Catholic Christianity has allotted to the sex of her who is "blessed among women;" the vast extent to which irreverence and irreligion have arrived in that country; the multitudes who treat with contempt the claims of the Church, and the office of the priesthood; and of those who go yet further, and either disbelieve every thing, or, at best, believe nothing; whilst, on the other hand, the overwhelming majority of those who have any religion at all, are sunk in superstition, corruption, and idolatry!

We have said enough, however, to indicate the very great value of the work which we have been reviewing, and shall therefore conclude by referring our readers for further particulars to its interesting pages, and tendering our warmest thanks to the judicious and talented author of "*The Practical Working of the Church of Spain.*"

ART. IV.—1. *Uncle Tom's Cabin ; or, Negro Life in the Slave States of America.* By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. Reprinted verbatim from the tenth American edition. London: Routledge and Co. 1852.

2. *Uncle Tom's Cabin.* By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. Author's Edition. London: Bosworth. 1852.

THERE is always something very pleasant to our apprehension in the discovery of a work of merit by a new author, one previously unknown to fame, or with whom we, at least, were not acquainted. It is like treading on the virgin soil "of some lone isle in unsuspected seas," where foot of man has never trod before. Accustomed, as we are, in nine cases out of ten, alas! to find novelty and barrenness faithful companions, our surprise has only a more peculiar zest when we become aware that we hold in our hands a work of genuine interest and of graphic power, which the world has not acknowledged; when we find that a new planet has arisen in the literary sky, and is shining directly in upon our minds and hearts.

There is nothing very promising in the title of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," and the vulgar variegated cover which first met our eyes at the railway-station, suggested nothing of a peculiarly elevated or superior order. The title-page, too, did not greatly tend to raise our expectations, for we could not but expect to meet with a party-spirited and probably somewhat rabid abolitionist invective, couched in the form of narrative; a series of manifest and violent misrepresentations, made to prove that slaves are all angels, and masters, of necessity, the most infamous of despots. And though our sympathies are in the main with the abolitionist cause, and we repudiate from our hearts the idea that one man can justifiably buy and sell another, at least under the Christian dispensation, for the purposes of labour, as though he were a brute beast, still we cannot but make allowances, on the other hand, for the melancholy position of those who have inherited this curse of slavery and slave-ownership; and we must appreciate the exceeding difficulty of summarily revolutionizing the social state of millions, consistently with either justice to the white, or the welfare of the black, population of the states in question.

We are stout abolitionists, indeed, in theory, and sooner or later we hold that slavery must be utterly expelled from all Chris-

tian lands; and there are certain monstrous evils, such as the forced separation of families, husbands and wives, children and parents, the rearing of entire classes, deprived of any power of denial or assent, for vicious and immoral purposes, and the absolute power over the very lives of their bondsmen exercised by slave-holders, which ought, in our opinion, to be immediately redressed, and, indeed, altogether uprooted from the soil. No compromise seems possible with such evils as these; no delay, no! not that of a single hour, seems justifiable in redressing them. Every passing moment, which sees the laws and statutes unrepealed that sanction such horrible iniquities, casts, we must say, a weight of bloodshed on the heads of our American brethren, and pleads against them with awful energy before the Lord of quick and dead.

And, supposing these terrible evils, of which we shall yet say more, to be redressed (and if they cannot be, consistently with the existence of slavery, as some maintain, then let slavery indeed be trampled on by the iron hoof of violence! say we; *then* are the bitter hatred and uncompromising violence of the most thorough-going abolitionist, in our estimation, amply justified); but supposing even these enormities to be rendered impossibilities by just and Christian laws, still, under its best of aspects, slavery would remain, we repeat, an institution incompatible, in the long run, with the free spirit of Christianity; and measures should therefore immediately be taken for the *gradual* redemption of the whole of these enslaved classes from their unnatural bondage. The recent will of that great American statesman, Henry Clay, is probably well known to many of our readers, and appears to meet our views in this respect: all the younger slaves on his estate, when they attain the age of seven or eight and twenty, are to be set free, whilst for some years previous to their liberation a certain portion of time is to be accorded to them, weekly and daily, in which they can labour for themselves, so as to acquire sufficient capital to carry them to Liberia at the expiration of that period. And this seems to us a wise and humane method of procedure; wiser and humaner than casting them out, young or old, upon the broad stream of human existence, to sink or swim as chance or Providence may direct.

That slavery is inconsistent with Christianity we are firmly persuaded, although no direct assault is made upon that institution in Holy Scripture, for obvious reasons, which it seems needless to enumerate. Enough is there told us to demonstrate that man was intended to be *a free agent*, and that absolute or unconditional obedience is due but to God only. "If thou can'st be made free, use it rather," says the Apostle, intimating at least that liberty

is the preferable and the more natural condition for the Christian ; and though he bade Onesimus return to Philemon, recognizing rights which were sanctioned by the law of that age and country, yet he expressly charges the master to receive his servant no longer "as a slave," whatever human edicts might choose to call him, but "as a brother beloved." Our blessed Lord also maintains the doctrines of *true* liberty and *true* equality with the most severe distinctness, forbidding us to "call any man *father* upon earth," that is, to yield him an unreserved, unqualified obedience, such as it is the very essence of slavery to demand from the enslaved classes, and giving men distinctly to understand that they are all equal in the sight of their God.

Indeed, it were a waste of labour to endeavour to demonstrate that no one man, on Christian principles, can be the absolute lord and master of another man ; that every creature possessing an immortal soul should be treated as a free agent and a reasonable being. Our Lord bids us bear evil without resenting it, at least as far as revenge on the offender is concerned, whatever we may do for the sake of bringing him to a better state of mind, or for the benefit of society ; we are not to render blow for blow. Then much less can we be justified in claiming the actual proprietorship of all the powers of another man, whether for good or evil, and coercing his will to blind obedience by stripes or imprisonment, or other more grievous punishment as the case may be.

Doubtless slavery might be recognized under the ancient covenant, though it could barely be said to be tolerated by the Law ; but it is plainly inconsistent with the spirit of that Gospel which bids us "break the yoke asunder and let the oppressed go free." And further, it is opposed to all the best and purest instincts of humanity. Man is indeed a fallen creature, but God has willed that he should remain a free agent, even in his fall ; and it is not for a brother mortal to deprive him of that liberty of thought, and word, and action, which the Omnipotent Ruler of mankind has chosen to leave at his disposal ! We need be at no further pains to render manifest this self-evident fact ; we hold that the moral monstrosity of slavery under the Christian covenant is undeniable ; and, nevertheless, as in our estimation, all great and sudden social changes are to be deprecated, so, more especially, does it appear desirable in this instance, for the sake of the oppressed as well as of the oppressors, that prudence should temper justice, and that the liberation of the various coloured classes in the slave states of America should be accomplished gradually and upon fixed principles, the chief abuses and enormities of the existing system being in the mean time dealt with, and, as far as possible, all lingering vestiges of them erased.

But now let us return to that most interesting work which has led us into this train of thought, a work which, if we mistake not, is calculated to make the name of Harriet Beecher Stowe, the wife, it seems, of an American professor of Lane Seminary, Ohio, quite as famous on this, as it has already become on the other shore of the Atlantic. It is a book replete, we should say, with the most truthful details, set off by a fund of genuine humour, and more especially characterized by exquisite and truly irresistible pathos, tenderness, and grace. The refinement of soul which it exhibits, in the main, despite the singularly wilful Americanisms in the phraseology which too often meet our eyes, has scarcely been equalled by any previous American prosaist or poet; whether the elegant but feeble Bryant, or the somewhat artificial yet delightful Longfellow with his laboured simplicity, or the pains-taking and ingenious Hawthorne, or even the charming Washington Irving be brought to mind. We are inclined to think that in portions of the work before us, more especially in those which treat of the exquisite child, *Evangeline*, Mrs. Stowe has soared to a higher pitch than either of these authors; making, however, a special reservation in favour of the delightful poem of the same name, "*Evangeline*," by Longfellow, that strain of calm and plaintive tenderness, like some soft moonlight night, deep and holy, with innumerable stars beaming stilly in the far ether, and the nightingale's sweet melodies flooding the grove; and further excepting perhaps some of Washington Irving's short prose sketches. But comparisons are needless and ungracious. Mrs. Stowe's work will speak for itself, if we will but allow it so to do; and we shall now proceed to gratify our readers with a somewhat lengthy extract from its opening chapter. Thus then does she commence her interesting narration.

"Late in the afternoon of a chilly day in February, two gentlemen were sitting alone over their wine, in a well-furnished dining parlour, in the town of P——, in Kentucky. There were no servants present, and the gentlemen, with chairs closely approaching, seemed to be discussing some subject with great earnestness.

"For convenience sake, we have said, hitherto, two *gentlemen*. One of the parties, however, when critically examined, did not seem, strictly speaking, to come under the species. He was a short, thick-set man, with coarse, common-place features, and that swaggering air of pretension which marks a low man who is trying to elbow his way upward in the world. He was much over-dressed, in a gaudy vest of many colours, a blue neckerchief, bedropped gaily with yellow spots, and arranged with a flaunting tie, quite in keeping with the general air of the man. His hands, large and coarse, were plentifully bedecked with rings; and he wore a heavy gold watch-chain, with a bundle of seals of portentous size, and a great variety of colours, attached to it, which, in the ardour

of conversation, he was in the habit of flourishing and jingling with evident satisfaction. His conversation was in free and easy defiance of Murray's Grammar, and was garnished at convenient intervals with various profane expressions, which not even the desire to be graphic in our account shall induce us to transcribe.

"His companion, Mr. Shelby, had the appearance of a gentleman; and the arrangements of the house, and the general air of the house-keeping, indicated easy and even opulent circumstances. As we before stated, the two were in the midst of an earnest conversation.

" 'That is the way I should arrange the matter,' said Mr. Shelby.

" 'I can't make trade that way—I positively can't, Mr. Shelby,' said the other, holding up a glass of wine between his eye and the light.

" 'Why, the fact is, Haley, Tom is an uncommon fellow; he is certainly worth that sum any where,—steady, honest, capable, manages my whole farm like a clock.'

" 'You mean honest, as niggers go,' said Haley, helping himself to a glass of brandy.

" 'No, I mean really, Tom is a good, steady, sensible, pious fellow. He got religion at a camp-meeting, four years ago; and I believe he really *did* get it. I've trusted him, since then, with every thing I have,—money, house, horses,—and let him come and go round the country; and I always found him true and square in every thing.'

" 'Some folks don't believe there is pious niggers, Shelby,' said Haley, with a candid flourish of his hand; 'but *I do*. I had a fellow, now, in this yer last lot I took to Orleans—'t was as good as a meetin' now, really, to hear that critter pray, and he was quite gentle and quiet like. He fetched me a good sum, too; for I bought him cheap of a man that was 'bliged to sell out; so I realized six hundred on him. Yes, I consider religion a valeyable thing in a nigger, when it's the genuine article, and no mistake.'

" 'Well, Tom's got the real article, if ever a fellow had,' rejoined the other. 'Why, last fall, I let him go to Cincinnati alone, to do business for me, and bring home five hundred dollars. Tom,' says I to him, 'I trust you, because I think you're a Christian—I know you wouldn't cheat.' Tom comes back sure enough—I knew he would. Some low fellows, they say, said to him: 'Tom, why don't you make tracks for Canada?' 'Ah, master trusted me, and I couldn't!' They told me about it. I am sorry to part with Tom, I must say. You ought to let him cover the whole balance of the debt: and you would, Haley, if you had any conscience.'

" 'Well I've got just as much conscience as any man in business can afford to keep,—just a little, you know, to swear by, as 'twere,' said the trader, jocularly; 'and then I'm ready to do any thing in reason, to 'blige friends; but this yer, you see, is a leetle too hard on a fellow—a leetle too hard.'

"The trader sighed contemplatively, and poured out some more brandy.

“ ‘ Well, then, Haley, how will you trade ? ’ said Mr. Shelby, after an uneasy interval of silence.

“ ‘ Well, hav’n’t you a boy or gal that you could throw in with Tom ? ’

“ ‘ Hum !—none that I could well spare ; to tell the truth, it’s only hard necessity makes me willing to sell at all. I don’t like parting with any of my hands, that’s a fact.’

“ Here the door opened, and a small quadroon boy, between four and five years of age, entered the room. There was something in his appearance remarkably beautiful and engaging. His black hair, fine as floss silk, hung in glossy curls about his round, dimpled face, while a pair of large dark eyes, full of fire and softness, looked out from beneath the rich long lashes, as he peered curiously into the apartment. A gay robe of scarlet and yellow plaid, carefully made and neatly fitted, set off to advantage the dark and rich style of his beauty ; and a certain comic air of assurance, blended with bashfulness, showed that he had been not unused to being petted and noticed by his master.

“ ‘ Hulloo, Jim Crow ! ’ said Mr. Shelby, whistling, and snapping a bunch of raisins towards him, ‘ pick that up, now ! ’

“ The child scampered, with all his little strength, after the prize, while his master laughed.

“ ‘ Come here, Jim Crow,’ said he.

“ The child came up, and the master patted the curly head, and chucked him under the chin.

“ ‘ Now, Jim, show this gentleman how you can dance and sing.’

“ The boy commenced one of those wild, grotesque songs common among the negroes, in a rich, clear voice, accompanying his singing with many comic evolutions of the hands, feet, and whole body, all in perfect time to the music.

“ ‘ Bravo ! ’ said Haley, throwing him a quarter of an orange.

“ ‘ Now, Jim, walk like old Uncle Cudjoe when he has the rheumatism,’ said his master.

“ Instantly the flexible limbs of the child assumed the appearance of deformity and distortion, as, with his back humped up, and his master’s stick in his hand, he hobbled about the room, his childish face drawn into a doleful pucker, and spitting from right to left, in imitation of an old man.

“ Both gentlemen laughed uproariously.

“ ‘ Now, Jim,’ said his master, ‘ show us how old Elder Robbins leads his psalm.’

“ The boy drew his chubby face down to a formidable length, and commenced toning a psalm-tune through his nose with imperturbable gravity.

“ ‘ Hurrah ! bravo ! what a young ’un ! ’ said Haley ; ‘ that chap’s a case, I’ll promise. Tell you what,’ said he, suddenly clapping his hand on Mr. Shelby’s shoulder, ‘ fling in that chap, and I’ll settle the business—I will. Come, now, if that ain’t doing the thing up about the rightest ! ’

“ At this moment, the door was pushed gently open, and a young quadroon woman, apparently about twenty-five, entered the room.

“ There needed only a glance from the child to her, to identify her as its mother. There was the same rich, full, dark eye, with its long lashes; the same ripples of silky black hair. The brown of her complexion gave way on the cheek to a perceptible flush, which deepened as she saw the gaze of the strange man fixed upon her in bold and undisguised admiration. Her dress was of the neatest possible fit, and set off to advantage her finely-moulded shape. A delicately-formed hand, and a trim foot and ankle, were items of appearance that did not escape the quick eye of the trader, well used to run up at a glance the points of a fine female article.

“ ‘ Well, Eliza ? ’ said her master, as she stopped and looked hesitatingly at him.

“ ‘ I was looking for Harry, please, sir ; ’ and the boy bounded toward her, showing his spoils, which he had gathered in the skirt of his robe.

“ ‘ Well, take him away, then, ’ said Mr. Shelby ; and hastily she withdrew, carrying the child on her arm.

“ ‘ By Jupiter ! ’ said the trader, turning to him in admiration, ‘ there’s an article now ! You might make your fortune on that ar gal in Orlean, any day. I’ve seen over a thousand, in my day, paid down for gals not a bit handsomer.’

“ ‘ I don’t want to make my fortune on her, ’ said Mr. Shelby, drily ; and, seeking to turn the conversation, he uncorked a bottle of fresh wine, and asked his companion’s opinion of it.

“ ‘ Capital, sir—first chop ! ’ said the trader ; then turning, and slapping his hand familiarly on Shelby’s shoulder, he added : ‘ Come, how will you trade about the gal ? what shall I say for her ? what’ll you take ? ’

“ ‘ Mr. Haley, she is not to be sold, ’ said Shelby ; ‘ my wife would not part with her for her weight in gold.’

“ ‘ Ay, ay, women always say such things, cause they ha’nt no sort of calculation. Just show ’em how many watches, feathers, and trinkets one’s weight in gold would buy, and that alters the case, I reckon.’

“ ‘ I tell you, Haley, this must not be spoken of. I say no, and I mean no, ’ said Shelby, decidedly.

“ ‘ Well, you’ll let me have the boy, though ? ’ said the trader ; ‘ you must own I’ve come down pretty handsomely for him.’

“ ‘ What on earth can you want with the child ? ’ said Shelby.

“ ‘ Why, I’ve got a friend that’s going into this yer branch of the business—wants to buy up handsome boys to raise for the market. F’nncy articles entirely—sell for waiters, and so on, to rich ’uns, that can pay for handsome ’uns. It sets off one of yer great places—a real handsome boy to open door, wait, and tend. They fetch a good sum ; and this little devil is such a comical, musical concern, he’s just the article.’

“ ‘ I would rather not sell him, ’ said Mr. Shelby, thoughtfully ; ‘ the fact is, sir, I’m a humane man, and I hate to take the boy from his mother, sir.’

“ ‘ Oh, you do?—La! yes—something of that ar natur. I understand, perfectly. It is mighty onpleasant getting on with women sometimes. I al’ays hates these yer screechin’, screamin’ times. They are *mighty* onpleasant; but, as I manages business, I generally avoids ’em, sir. Now, what if you get the girl off for a day, or a week, or so; then the thing’s done quietly,—all over before she comes home. Your wife might get her some ear-rings, or a new gown, or some such truck, to make up with her.’

“ ‘ I’m afraid not.’

“ ‘ Lor bless ye, yes! These critters an’t like white folks, you know; they gets over things, only manage right. Now, they say,’ said Haley, assuming a candid and confidential air, ‘ that this kind o’ trade is hardening to the feelings; but I never found it so. Fact is, I never could do things up the way some fellers manage the business. I’ve seen ’em as would pull a woman’s child out of her arms, and set him up to sell, and she screechin’ like mad all the time;—very bad policy—damages the article—makes ’em quite unfit for service sometimes. I knew a real handsome gal once, in Orleans, as was entirely ruined by this sort o’ handling. The fellow that was trading for her didn’t want her baby; and she was one of your real high sort, when her blood was up. I tell you, she squeezed up her child in her arms, and talked, and went on real awful. It kinder makes my blood run cold to think on’t; and when they carried off the child, and locked her up, she jest went ravin’ mad, and died in a week. Clear waste, sir, of a thousand dollars, just for want of management,—there’s where ’t is. It’s always best to do the humane thing, sir; that’s been *my* experience.’

“ And the trader leaned back in his chair, and folded his arms, with an air of virtuous decision, apparently considering himself a second Wilberforce.

“ The subject appeared to interest the gentleman deeply; for while Mr. Shelby was thoughtfully peeling an orange, Haley broke out afresh, with becoming diffidence, but as if actually driven by the force of truth to say a few words more.

“ ‘ It don’t look well, now for a feller to be praisin’ himself; but I say it jest because it’s the truth. I believe I’m reckoned to bring in about the finest droves of niggers that is brought in—at least I’ve been told so; if I have once, I reckon I have a hundred times—all in good case—fat and likely, and I lose as few as any man in the business. And I lays it all to my management, sir; and humanity, sir, I may say, is the great pillar of *my* management.’

“ Mr. Shelby did not know what to say, and so he said, ‘ Indeed!’

“ ‘ Now, I’ve been laughed at for my notions, sir, and I’ve been talked to. They an’t pop’lar, and they an’t common; but I stuck to ’em, sir; I’ve stuck to ’em, and realized well on ’em; yes, sir, they have paid their passage, I may say;’ and the trader laughed at his joke.

“ There was something so piquant and original in these elucidations of humanity, that Mr. Shelby could not help laughing in company. Perhaps

you laugh too, dear reader; but you know humanity comes out in a variety of strange forms now-a-days, and there is no end to the odd things that humane people will say and do.

“ Mr. Shelby's laugh encouraged the trader to proceed.

“ ‘ It's strange, now, but I never could beat this into people's heads. Now, there was Tom Loker, my old partner, down in Natchez; he was a clever fellow, Tom was, only the very devil with niggers—on principle 't was you see, for a better-hearted fellow never broke bread; 't was his *system*, sir. I used to talk to Tom. ‘ Why, Tom,’ I used to say, ‘ when your gals takes on and cry, what's the use o' crackin' on 'em over the head, and knockin' on 'em round? It's ridiculous,’ says I, ‘ and don't do no sort o' good. Why, I don't see no harm in their cryin',’ says I; ‘ it is natur,’ says I, ‘ and if natur can't blow off one way, it will another. Besides Tom,’ says I, ‘ it jest spiles your gals; they get sickly, and down in the mouth; and sometimes they gets ugly—particular yellow girls do, and it's the devil and all gettin' on 'em broke in. Now,’ says I, ‘ why can't you kinder coax 'em up, and speak 'em fair? Depend on it, Tom, a little humanity, thrown in along, goes a heap further than all your jawin' and crackin'; and it pays better,’ says I, ‘ depend on't. But Tom couldn't get the hang on't; and he spoiled so many for me, that I had to break off with him, though he was a good-hearted fellow, and as fair a business hand as is goin'.’

“ ‘ And do you find your ways of managing do the business better than Tom's?’ said Mr. Shelby.

“ ‘ Why, yes, sir, I may so. You see, when I any ways can, I takes a leetle care about the onpleasan' parts, like selling young uns and that—get the gals out of the way—out of sight, out of mind, you know; and when it's clean done, and can't be helped, they naturally gets used to it. 'Tan't, you know, as if it was white folks, that's brought up in the way of 'spectin' to keep their children and wives, and all that. Niggers, you know, that's fetched up properly, ha'n't no kind of 'spectations of no kind; so all these things comes easier.’

“ ‘ I'm afraid mine are not properly brought up, then,’ said Mr. Shelby.

“ ‘ S'pose not. You Kentucky folks spile your niggers. You mean well by 'em, but 'taint no real kindness, arter all. Now, a nigger, you see, what's got to be hacked and tumbled round the world, and sold to Tom, and Dick, and the Lord knows who, 'tan't no kindness to be givin' on him notions and expectations, and bringin' on him up too well, for the rough and tumble comes all the harder on him arter. Now, I venture to say, your niggers would be quite chop-fallen in a place where some of your plantation niggers would be singing and whooping like all possessed. Every man, you know, Mr. Shelby, naturally thinks well of his own ways; and I think, I treat niggers just about as well as it's ever worth while to treat 'em.’

“ ‘ It's a happy thing to be satisfied,’ said Mr. Shelby, with a slight shrug, and some perceptible feelings of a disagreeable nature.

“ ‘ Well,’ said Haley, after they had both silently picked their nuts for a season, ‘ what do you say ?’

“ ‘ I’ll think the matter over, and talk with my wife,’ said Mr. Shelby. ‘ Meantime, Haley, if you want the matter carried on in the quiet way you speak of, you’d best not let your business in this neighbourhood be known. It will get out among my boys, and it will not be a particularly quiet business getting away any of my fellows, if they know it, I’ll promise you.’

“ ‘ Oh ! certainly, by all means, mum ! of course. But I’ll tell you, I’m in a devil of a hurry, and shall want to know, as soon as possible, what I may depend on,’ said he, rising and putting on his overcoat.

“ ‘ Well, call up this evening, between six and seven, and you shall have my answer,’ said Mr. Shelby, and the trader bowed himself out of the apartment.”—pp. 1—6.

Can any thing be conceived more forcibly graphic than this commencement ? With what distinctness is the well-meaning but common-place slave-proprietor brought before our mental eye ! And the slave-dealer, with his impudent swagger, and coarse pretensions to humanity,—though we may never have chanced to meet individuals of this species, do we not all feel that he must be portrayed to the very life ? It is a fearful thing, however, to remember, that what may be sport to us to read of is the most awful reality to tens of thousands of our fellow-creatures dowered with immortal souls. The inhuman cruelties, which Haley so coolly discusses, are, we may be sure, no creations of a diseased imagination, or of an angry party spirit, but every-day occurrences, which would be spoken of in this very tone of quiet observation by the persons here introduced to us, and mourned over by the best and wisest with a calm serenity of spirit, as evils more or less inseparable from the legalized existence of slavery. When we allow our minds to rest upon these miserable facts we can understand the bitterest wrath of American abolitionists, and appreciate the feeling which demands that such a curse to humanity be swept instantaneously and at whatever sacrifices from the land.

But there is another side to the picture, the aspect of which may modify our transports of indignation ; even Mrs. Stowe confesses and declares that there is much of positive happiness among slaves in America ; and though nothing can alter our conviction that slavery is a most terrible evil which ought to be absolutely abolished, yet calm consideration teaches us, that too great haste is not to be desired, and that the desired change should be gradual and peaceable. “ Perhaps,” says Mrs. Stowe,

“ Perhaps the mildest form of the system of slavery is to be seen in

the State of Kentucky. The general prevalence of agricultural pursuits of a quiet and gradual nature, not requiring those periodic seasons of hurry and pressure that are called for in the business of more southern districts, makes the task of the negro a more healthful and reasonable one; while the master, content with a more gradual style of acquisition, has not those temptations to hardheartedness which always overcome frail human nature when the prospect of sudden and rapid gain is weighed in the balance, with no heavier counterpoise than the interests of the helpless and unprotected.

“Whoever visits some estates there, and witnesses the good-humoured indulgence of some masters and mistresses, and the affectionate loyalty of some slaves, might be tempted to dream the oft-fabled poetic legend of a patriarchal institution, and all that; but over and above the scene there broods a portentous shadow—the shadow of *law*. So long as the law considers all these human beings, with beating hearts and living affections, only as so many *things* belonging to a master—so long as the failure, or misfortune, or imprudence, or death of the kindest owner, may cause them any day to exchange a life of kind protection and indulgence for one of hopeless misery and toil—so long it is impossible to make any thing beautiful or desirable in the best-regulated administration of slavery.”—pp. 6, 7.

This possible transfer at any time from a kind to a cruel master, combined with the separation of mother and child, husband and wife, for ever, is an evil not to be characterized by words. The terrors of Eliza, the mother of the happy child who has been introduced to us, lest her master should sell it to the slave-dealer Haley, are laughed away by Mrs. Shelby, who cannot for a moment imagine that her husband would dispose of their little favourite to such a man. She is represented as a woman of a very superior order, who strives to make all her slaves both good and happy, and is looked up to by them with the most unwavering and ardent affection. She is ignorant of her husband's pecuniary embarrassments, and feels assured that he will do nothing to hurt her feelings, which are very warmly interested in behalf of Eliza, her favourite maid, who has been married at her instigation to the bondsman of a neighbouring slave-owner; but we must allow Mrs. Stowe once more to speak for herself in the following graphic and most painful history:—

“Eliza had been brought up by her mistress, from girlhood, as a petted and indulged favourite.

“The traveller in the south must often have remarked that peculiar air of refinement, that softness of voice and manner, which seems in many cases to be a particular gift to the quadroon and mulatto women. These natural graces in the quadroon are often united with beauty of the most dazzling kind, and in almost every case with a personal appearance prepossessing and agreeable. Eliza, such as we have described

her, is not a fancy sketch, but taken from remembrance, as we saw her years ago in Kentucky. Safe under the protecting care of her mistress, Eliza had reached maturity without those temptations which make beauty so fatal an inheritance to a slave. She had been married to a bright and talented young mulatto man, who was a slave on a neighbouring estate, and bore the name of George Harris.

“ This young man had been hired out by his master to work in a bagging factory, where his adroitness and ingenuity caused him to be considered the first hand in the place. He had invented a machine for the cleaning of the hemp, which, considering the education and circumstances of the inventor, displayed quite as much mechanical genius as Whitney’s cottin-gin.

“ He was possessed of a handsome person and pleasing manners, and was a general favourite in the factory. Nevertheless, as this young man was in the eye of the law, not a man, but a thing, all these superior qualifications were subject to the control of a vulgar, narrow-minded, tyrannical master. This same gentleman, having heard of the fame of George’s invention, took a ride over to the factory, to see what this intelligent chattel had been about. He was received with great enthusiasm by the employer, who congratulated him on possessing so valuable a slave.

“ He was waited upon over the factory, and shown the machinery by George, who, in high spirits, talked so fluently, held himself so erect, looked so handsome and manly, that his master began to feel an uneasy consciousness of inferiority. What business had his slave to be marching round the country, inventing machines, and holding up his head among gentlemen? He’d soon put a stop to it. He’d take him back, and put him to hoeing and digging, and ‘ see if he’d step about so smart.’ Accordingly, the manufacturer and all hands concerned were astounded when he suddenly demanded George’s wages, and announced his intention of taking him home.

“ ‘ But, Mr. Harris,’ remonstrated the manufacturer, ‘ isn’t this rather sudden?’

“ ‘ What if it is?—isn’t the man *mine*?’

“ ‘ We would be willing, sir, to increase the rate of compensation.’

“ ‘ No object at all, sir. I don’t need to hire any of my hands out, unless I’ve a mind to.’

“ ‘ But, sir, he seems peculiarly adapted to this business.’

“ ‘ Dare say he may be; never was much adapted to any thing that I set him about, I’ll be bound.’

“ ‘ But only think of his inventing this machine,’ interposed one of the workmen, rather unluckily.

“ ‘ Oh yes!—a machine for saving work, is it? He’d invent that, I’ll be bound; let a nigger alone for that, any time. They are all labour-saving machines themselves, every one of ’em. No, he shall tramp!’

“ George had stood like one transfixed, at hearing his doom thus suddenly pronounced by a power that he knew was irresistible. He folded his arms, tightly pressed in his lips, but a whole volcano of bitter

feelings burned in his bosom, and sent streams of fire through his veins. He breathed short, and his large dark eyes flashed like live coals; and he might have broken out into some dangerous ebullition, had not the kindly manufacturer touched him on the arm, and said, in a low tone:

“ ‘Give way, George; go with him for the present. We'll try to help you, yet.’

“ The tyrant observed the whisper, and conjectured its import, though he could not hear what was said; and he inwardly strengthened himself in his determination to keep the power he possessed over his victim.

“ George was taken home, and put to the meanest drudgery of the farm. He had been able to repress every disrespectful word; but the flashing eye, the gloomy and troubled brow, were a part of a natural language that could not be repressed—indubitable signs, which showed too plainly that the man could not become a thing.

“ It was during the happy period of his employment in the factory that George had seen and married his wife. During that period—being much trusted and favoured by his employer—he had free liberty to come and go at discretion. The marriage was highly approved of by Mrs. Shelby, who, with a little womanly complacency in match-making, felt pleased to unite her handsome favourite with one of her own class who seemed in every way suited to her; and so they were married in her mistress's great parlour, and her mistress herself adorned the bride's beautiful hair with orange-blossoms, and threw over it the bridal veil, which certainly could scarce have rested on a fairer head; and there was no lack of white gloves, and cake and wine—of admiring guests to praise the bride's beauty, and her mistress's indulgence and liberality. For a year or two Eliza saw her husband frequently, and there was nothing to interrupt their happiness, except the loss of two infant children, to whom she was passionately attached, and whom she mourned with a grief so intense as to call for gentle remonstrance from her mistress, who sought, with maternal anxiety, to direct her naturally passionate feelings within the bounds of reason and religion.

“ After the birth of little Harry, however, she had gradually become tranquillized and settled; and every bleeding tie and throbbing nerve, once more entwined with that little life, seemed to become sound and healthful, and Eliza was a happy woman up to the time that her husband was rudely torn from his kind employer, and brought under the iron sway of his legal owner.

“ The manufacturer, true to his word, visited Mr. Harris a week or two after George had been taken away, when, as he hoped, the heat of the occasion had passed away, and tried every possible inducement to lead him to restore him to his former employment.

“ ‘You needn't trouble yourself to talk any longer,’ said he, doggedly; ‘I know my own business, sir.’

“ ‘I did not presume to interfere with it, sir. I only thought that you might think it for your interest to let your man to us on the terms proposed.’

“ ‘ Oh, I understand the matter well enough. I saw your winking and whispering, the day I took him out of the factory ; but you don't come it over me that way. It's a free country, sir ; the man's *mine*, and I do what I please with him—that's it ! ’

“ And so fell George's last hope ;—nothing before him but a life of toil and drudgery, rendered more bitter by every little smarting vexation and indignity which tyrannical ingenuity could devise.

“ A very humane jurist once said : ‘ The worst use you can put a man to is to hang him. ’ No ; there is another use that a man can be put to that is worse ! ”—pp. 8—10.

This is indeed most terrible ; the more so, because we are convinced that it is too accurate a picture. The envy of a little mind must be bitter in its effects when it is felt by a master towards his slave ; envy occasioned the first murder, and is always murderous in intent ; but what a nameless curse must it prove under such circumstances ! And they are Christian laws, made and approved by Christian men, which yield such power ! But further, in the interview that follows between Eliza and her husband, we are taught to appreciate the latter's fate more clearly. There we read :—

“ ‘ Patient ! ’ said he, interrupting her ; ‘ hav'n't I been patient ? Did I say a word when he came and took me away, for no earthly reason, from the place where everybody was kind to me ? I'd paid him truly every cent of my earnings ; and they all say I worked well. ’

“ ‘ Well, it is dreadful, ’ said Eliza ; ‘ but, after all, he is your master, you know. ’

“ ‘ My master ! and who made him my master ? That's what I think of—what right has he to me ? I'm a man as much as he is ; I'm a better man than he is ; I know more about business than he does ; I'm a better manager than he is ; I can read better than he can ; I can write a better hand ; and I've learned it all myself, and no thanks to him—I've learned it in spite of him ; and now what right has he to make a dray-horse of me ?—to take me from things I can do, and do better than he can, and put me to work that any horse can do ? He tries to do it ; he says he'll bring me down and humble me, and he puts me to just the hardest, meanest, and dirtiest work, on purpose. ’

“ ‘ Oh, George—George—you frighten me ! Why, I never heard you talk so ; I'm afraid you'll do something dreadful. I don't wonder at your feelings at all ; but oh, do be careful—do, do—for my sake—for Harry's ! ’

“ ‘ I have been careful, and I have been patient ; but it's growing worse and worse—flesh and blood can't bear it any longer. Every chance he can get to insult and torment me, he takes. I thought I could do my work well, and keep on quiet, and have some time to read and learn out of work-hours ; but the more he sees I can do, the more he loads on. He says that though I don't say any thing, he sees I've

got the devil in me, and he means to bring it out; and one of these days it will come out in a way that he won't like, or I'm mistaken.'

" 'Oh, dear, what shall we do?' said Eliza, mournfully.

" 'It was only yesterday,' said George, 'as I was busy loading stones into a cart, that young Mas'r Tom stood there, slashing his whip so near the horse, that the creature was frightened. I asked him to stop, as pleasant as I could: he just kept right on. I begged him again, and then he turned on me, and began striking me. I held his hand, and then he screamed, and kicked, and ran to his father, and told him that I was fighting him. He came in a rage, and said he'd teach me who was my master; and he tied me to a tree, and cut switches for young master, and told him that he might whip me till he was tired; and he did do it. If I don't make him remember it some time!'

" And the brow of the young man grew dark, and his eyes burned with an expression that made his young wife tremble. 'Who made this man my master—that's what I want to know?' he said.

" 'Well,' said Eliza, mournfully, 'I always thought that I must obey my master and mistress, or I couldn't be a Christian.'

" 'There is some sense in it, in your case: they have brought you up like a child—fed you, clothed you, indulged you, and taught you, so that you have a good education,—that is some reason why they should claim you. But I have been kicked, and cuffed, and sworn at, and at the best only let alone; and what do I owe? I've paid for all my keeping a hundred times over. I *won't* bear it—no, I *won't*!' he said, clenching his hand with a fierce frown.

" Eliza trembled and was silent. She had never seen her husband in this mood before; and her gentle system of ethics seemed to bend like a reed in the surges of such passions.

" 'You know poor little Carlo that you gave me?' added George; 'the creature has been about all the comfort that I've had. He has slept with me nights, and followed me around days, and kind o' looked at me as if he understood how I felt. Well, the other day I was just feeding him with a few old scraps I picked up by the kitchen-door, and Mas'r came along, and said I was feeding him up at his expense, and that he couldn't afford to have every nigger keeping his dog, and ordered me to tie a stone to his neck, and throw him in the pond.'

" 'Oh, George, you didn't do it!'

" 'Do it—not I; but he did. Mas'r and Tom pelted the poor drowning creature with stones. Poor thing! he looked at me so mournful, as if he wondered why I didn't save him. I had to take a flogging because I wouldn't do it myself. I don't care; Mas'r will find out that I'm one that whipping won't tame. My day will come yet, if he don't look out.'

" 'What are you going to do? Oh, George, don't do any thing wicked; if you only trust in God, and try to do right, he'll deliver you.'

" 'I an't a Christian like you, Eliza; my heart's full of bitterness; I can't trust in God. Why does He let things be so?'

" 'Oh, George, we must have faith! Mistress says that when all

things go wrong to us, we must believe that God is doing the very best.'

" 'That's easy to say, for people that are sitting on their sofas, and riding in their carriages; but let 'em be where I am, I guess it would come some harder. I wish I could be good; but my heart burns, and can't be reconciled anyhow. You couldn't, in my place; you can't now, if I tell you all I've got to say. You don't know the whole yet.'

" 'What can be coming now?'

" 'Well, lately Mas'r has been saying, that he was a fool to let me marry off the place; that he hates Mr. Shelby and all his tribe, because they are proud, and hold their heads up above him, and that I've got proud notions from you: and he says he won't let me come here any more, and that I shall take a wife and settle down on his place. At first he only scolded and grumbled these things; but yesterday he told me that I should take Mina for a wife, and settle down in a cabin with her, or he would sell me down river.'

" 'Why, but you were married to me, by the minister, as much as if you'd been a white man,' said Eliza, simply.

" 'Don't you know a slave can't be married? There is no law in this country for that: I can't hold you for my wife, if he chooses to part us. That's why I wish I'd never seen you—why I wish I'd never been born; it would have been better for us both—it would have been better for this poor child if he had never been born. All this may happen to him yet!'

" 'Oh, but master is so kind!'

" 'Yes, but who knows? he may die; and then he may be sold to nobody knows who. What pleasure is it that he is handsome, and smart, and bright? I tell you, Eliza, that a sword will pierce through your soul for every good and pleasant thing your child is or has—it will make him worth too much for you to keep.'

" The words smote heavily on Eliza's heart: the vision of the trader came before her eyes, and, as if some one had struck her a deadly blow, she turned pale and gasped for breath."—pp. 11—13.

In consequence of all these evils the husband endeavours to effect his escape; and the gentle wife and mother, "Eliza," having learnt that her child is indeed to be taken from her, resolves to follow him, and actually flies at night, with her beloved boy resting in her arms. Let us turn from the fortunes of these fugitives to devote some of our attention to "Uncle Tom," one of the most delightful and consistent characters in the book, the cheerful, sensible, and pious negro, already alluded to in our first extract, and sold by his master Mr. Shelby to this slave-dealer Haley. We cannot, however, find space for extracts from the chapter which describes the cabin of Uncle Tom and its various inmates, though his respected wife and helpmate Aunt Chloe, the head cook of the Shelby establishment, with her strong affection for the family of her master, and her intense appreciation

of its dignity, and her own amusing vanity as mistress of the culinary art, would merit a careful delineation. We cannot forbear, however, remarking, how constantly we are reminded both of the good and evil traits in the *Irish* character by the language and deportment of these sable gentlemen and ladies; the same ardour and enthusiasm, the same strong and kindly feelings, the same love of ease and comfort, the same lively apprehension of the humorous: certainly the Irishman exceeds the African by far in wit, and probably also in the faculties of reasoning and imagination; but then he must be admitted to be far more quarrelsome and violent, and "hasty in his cups." Nothing can be further from our intention than to institute a comparison insulting to our Irish brethren: it is on the contrary the same cheerful "bonhommie," the same true kindness of heart and soul, the same devotional and enthusiastic temperament, which delight us in the negro, as delineated in the work before us, and which have often won our admiration in the Irishman at home. Any one who visits among the working classes cannot fail to be struck with the advantageous contrast which the Irish poor present in many respects to their English brethren: true, they are apt to keep their tenements in sad disorder, and they do occasionally indulge to excess in whisky, and then, under the influence of this poison, are guilty of the most extravagant acts of violence, and they have rather a knack of quarrelling at all times, (at least the men,—not, we should say, the women, speaking generally,) but they are never sulky, never coarsely or brutally uncivil, never ungrateful to Providence, or hardened against God, as we too often find the English poor; they keep their tempers and their passions in better order, in the main, and live far more happily in their families. But not to proceed with this digression, the resemblance between the Irish and African natural character has probably been often pointed out before, and can indeed scarcely escape the notice of the most careless observer.

The Christian magnanimity with which Uncle Tom bows to his hard fate in being sold by his master and separated from his wife and children is beautifully portrayed; indeed his misfortunes are used to show that the true Christian extracts good from all trials and miseries, and we are grateful to Mrs. Stowe for her enforcement of this great truth.

The account of the methodist meeting at "Uncle Tom's" is also exceedingly graphic and not a little amusing: the scraps of hymns cited by our authoress are curious and valuable, as suggesting what the instincts of our poorer brethren crave, and what *will* be supplied by others, baptists, papists, and all other se-

paratists, though we may stand aloof in stiff and sullen dignity. Wisely was it said by the wit, that "if the Church of England ever went the way of all flesh, the verdict on her ought to be 'Died of Gentility.'" We do not wish indeed for hymns expressive of the certainty of the salvation of all who join in them, or intensely individual in their character; but let us be assured that Tate and Brady's version of "the Psalms of David," however respectable, and in some cases even admirable, as we maintain it to be, will not suffice for congregational purposes, and that the hearts of Englishmen will still less be won by the diluted and diffuse and colourless translations of ancient hymns which certain individuals are endeavouring to impose upon us as possessing a species of authority, because emanating from "the Sarum Use!" Registering our protest against these totally unfounded notions, and expressing our conviction that we must have hymns of a far more thoroughly popular and *English* character than these, more distinctively Anglican, more clear and more emphatic, we pass on to the consideration of the work before us.

We would willingly extract an admirable chapter, in which an American senator and his charming little wife and family are introduced to us, as saving poor Eliza from her pursuers; the senator having resolved previous to her arrival to deliver up the very next fugitive who should fall in his way, as an obligation of stern policy and inexorable justice. But many a man's practice is better than his theory, and this proves the case in the present instance; the senator's humanity is unable to resist the appeal made to it by a fellow-creature in extreme distress. His amusing efforts to maintain his senatorial dignity and reconcile his principles with his benevolence will doubtless edify our readers as they have diverted us, but we cannot find space for the chapter, and a short extract would be comparatively valueless.

Without satisfying our readers' curiosity as to the eventual fate of George and Eliza (we usually consider it unfair to an author to forestall his catastrophe), we shall follow the fortunes of "Uncle Tom," who is carried off by Haley, and who, on his way to New Orleans for sale, in a steamer, has the good luck to save the life of a charming little girl, "Evangeline," whom we spoke of before, by jumping into the river after her, she having fallen overboard accidentally. Evangeline is the only daughter of a rich gentleman, by name Augustine St. Clare, the son of a wealthy planter of Louisiana, himself a great proprietor, possessor of innumerable slaves, and of a Moorish palace at New Orleans. Evangeline is thus happily described:

"Tom had often caught glimpses of this little girl—for she was one
VOL. XVIII.—NO. XXXV.—OCTOBER, 1852. R

of those busy, tripping creatures, that can be no more contained in one place than a sunbeam or a summer breeze, nor was she one that, once seen, could be easily forgotten.

“ Her form was the perfection of childish beauty, without its usual chubbiness and squareness of outline. There was about it an undulating and ærial grace, such as one might dream of for some mythic and allegorical being. Her face was remarkable less for its perfect beauty of feature than for a singular and dreamy earnestness of expression, which made the ideal start when they looked at her, and by which the dullest and most literal were impressed, without exactly knowing why. The shape of her head and the turn of her neck and bust were peculiarly noble, and the long golden-brown hair that floated like a cloud around it, the deep spiritual gravity of her violet blue eyes, shaded by heavy fringes of golden brown—all marked her out from other children, and made every one turn and look after her, as she glided hither and thither on the boat. Nevertheless, the little one was not what you would have called either a grave child or a sad one. On the contrary, an airy and innocent playfulness seemed to flicker like the shadow of summer leaves over her childish face, and around her buoyant figure. She was always in motion, always with a half smile on her rosy mouth, flying hither and thither, with an undulating and cloud-like tread, singing to herself as she moved, as in a happy dream. Her father and female guardian were incessantly busy in pursuit of her, but, when caught, she melted from them again like a summer cloud ; as no word of chiding or reproof ever fell on her ear for whatever she chose to do, she pursued her own way all over the boat. Always dressed in white, she seemed to move like a shadow through all sorts of places, without contracting spot or stain ; and there was not a corner or nook, above or below, where those fairy footsteps had not glided, and that visionary golden head, with its deep blue eyes, fled along.

“ The fireman, as he looked up from his sweaty toil, sometimes found those eyes looking wonderingly into the raging depths of the furnace, and fearfully and pityingly at him, as if she thought him in some dreadful danger. Anon the steersman at the wheel paused and smiled, as the picture-like head gleamed through the window of the round-house, and in a moment was gone again. A thousand times a-day rough voices blessed her, and smiles of unwonted softness stole over hard faces, as she passed ; and when she tripped fearlessly over dangerous places, rough, sooty hands were stretched involuntarily out to save her, and smooth her path.”—pp. 106, 107.

The way in which she first makes acquaintance with Uncle Tom, who almost takes her for “one of the angels out of his New Testament,” is very prettily conceived and delineated. Admirably portrayed also is her father, a very handsome, amiable, and elegant sensualist and unbeliever, not at all coarse or vulgar in his tastes, or addicted to any positive vices, and so kind to his slaves as to let them do pretty much what pleases them, but

devoid of all energy or earnestness, without an object in life, disappointed in his first and only love, married to a selfish and disagreeable woman whom he cannot respect, and lacking faith in either God or man. Of course he is unhappy, and Evangeline is the only consolation of his existence. It will be conceived therefore how favourably he regards the preserver of her life. Haley makes him pay an enormous price to become his possessor, and St. Clare places Tom in a post of honour in his grand establishment at New Orleans.

The various scenes in that city are for the most part admirably depicted, and present a strange image to the mind of Oriental magnificence, combined with dirt, disorder, and the most glaring immorality. Marie St. Clare, Augustine's wife, is the representative and living embodiment of all the conservative convictions of the friends of slavery, and she is made to find support for her peculiar views in the sermons of her favourite preachers whom she hears "at church." Our authoress speaks constantly by-the-by of "*the Church*," as though there were but one in America: and, we believe, she *does* mean the American Episcopal Church in the generality of instances, though this cannot be, when she speaks of the church-membership of Miss Ophelia St. Clare, an old maid from a New England state, cousin of Augustine, who comes to help him in the management of his household, his wife being a confirmed invalid, and who is manifestly a staunch and stern Presbyterian of true New England breed. Very admirably portrayed is the character of this Miss Ophelia, whom we learn to respect immediately, and even to love at last, from her combination of strong affection with self-denying conscientiousness. We can easily conceive how entirely out of her element such a visitant, from a sober and demure New England state, in the neighbourhood, we presume, of Boston or Philadelphia, would feel herself, in flaunting, flaring, noisy, wicked, Babylonian New Orleans. Her efforts to set such a household as St. Clare's in order, though earnest and unremitting, are crowned with very partial success. The chief value of this portion of Mrs. Stowe's work consists in its illustration of Augustine's theory, that you must either be the tyrant of your slaves, or entrust yourself very much to their tender mercies. We must find space for a conversation on the subject of slavery, which is exceedingly instructive as well as amusing in its way, happily illustrating the various characters of the personages introduced, and also conveying no little practical information.

" ' Well, ladies,' said St. Clare, as they were comfortably seated at the dinner-table, ' and what was the bill of fare at church to-day ?'

“ ‘ Oh, Dr. G—— preached a splendid sermon,’ said Marie. ‘ It was just such a sermon as you ought to hear ; it expressed all my views exactly.’

“ ‘ It must have been very improving,’ said St. Clare. ‘ The subject must have been an extensive one.’

“ ‘ Well, I mean all my views about society, and such things,’ said Marie. ‘ The text was, ‘ He hath made every thing beautiful in its season ;’ and he showed how all the orders and distinctions in society came from God ; and that it was so appropriate, you know, and beautiful, that some should be high and some low, and that some were born to rule and some to serve, and all that, you know ; and he applied it so well to all this ridiculous fuss that is made about slavery, and he proved distinctly that the Bible was on our side, and supported all our institutions so convincingly. I only wish you’d heard him.’

“ ‘ Oh, I didn’t need it,’ said St. Clare. ‘ I can learn what does me as much good as that from the Picayune any time, and smoke a cigar besides, which I can’t do, you know, in a church.’

“ ‘ Why,’ said Miss Ophelia, ‘ don’t you believe in these views ?’

“ ‘ Who—I ? You know I’m such a graceless dog, that these religious aspects of such subjects don’t edify me much. If I was to say any thing on this slavery matter, I would say out, fair and square, ‘ We’re in for it ; we’ve got ‘em and mean to keep ‘em—it’s for our convenience and our interest ;’ for that’s the long and short of it ; that’s just the whole of what all this sanctified stuff amounts to, after all ; and I think that will be intelligible to everybody, every where.’

“ ‘ I do think, Augustine, you are so irreverent !’ said Marie. ‘ I think it’s shocking to hear you talk.’

“ ‘ Shocking ! it’s the truth. This religious talk on such matters, why don’t they carry it a little further, and show the beauty, in its season, of a fellow’s taking a glass too much, and sitting a little too late over his cards, and various providential arrangements of that sort, which are pretty frequent among us young men ? we’d like to hear that those are right and godly, too.’

“ ‘ Well,’ said Miss Ophelia, ‘ do you think slavery right or wrong ?’

“ ‘ I’m not going to have any of your horrid New England directness, cousin,’ said St. Clare, gaily. ‘ If I answer that question, I know you’ll be at me with half a dozen others, each one harder than the last ; and I’m not going to define my position. I am one of that sort that lives by throwing stones at other people’s glass-houses ; but I never mean to put up one for them to stone.’

“ ‘ That’s just the way he’s always talking,’ said Marie ; ‘ you can’t get any satisfaction out of him. I believe it’s just because he don’t like religion that he’s always running out in this way he’s been doing.’

“ ‘ Religion !’ said St. Clare, in a tone that made both ladies look at him. ‘ Religion ! Is what you hear at church, religion ? Is that which can bend and turn, and descend and ascend, to fit every crooked phase of selfish, worldly society, religion ? Is that religion which is less scrupulous, less generous, less just, less considerate for man than even my

own ungodly, worldly, blinded nature? No! When I look for a religion, I must look for something above me, and not something beneath.'

" 'Then you don't believe that the Bible justifies slavery?' said Miss Ophelia.

" 'The Bible was my *mother's* book,' said St. Clare. 'By it she lived and died, and I would be very sorry to think it did. I'd as soon desire to have it proved that my mother could drink brandy, chew tobacco, and swear, by way of satisfying me that I did right in doing the same. It wouldn't make me at all more satisfied with these things in myself, and it would take from me the comfort of respecting her; and it really is a comfort, in this world, to have any thing one can respect. In short, you see,' said he, suddenly resuming his gay tone, 'all I want is that different things be kept in different boxes. The whole framework of society, both in Europe and America, is made up of various things which will not stand the scrutiny of any very ideal standard of morality. It's pretty generally understood that men don't aspire after the absolute right, but only to do about as well as the rest of the world. Now, when any one speaks up, like a man, and says slavery is necessary to us, we can't get along without it, we should be beggared if we give it up, and, of course, we mean to hold on to it—this is strong, clear, well-defined language; it has the respectability of truth to it; and if we may judge by their practice, the majority of the world will bear us out in it. But when he begins to put on a long face, and snuffle, and quote Scripture, I incline to think he isn't much better than he should be.'

" 'You are very uncharitable,' said Marie.

" 'Well,' said St. Clare, 'suppose that something should bring down the price of cotton once and for ever, and make the whole slave property a drug in the market; don't you think we should soon have another version of the Scripture doctrine? What a flood of light would pour into the church, all at once, and how immediately it would be discovered that every thing in the Bible and reason went the other way!'

" 'Well, at any rate,' said Marie, as she reclined herself on a lounge, 'I'm thankful I'm born where slavery exists; and I believe it's right—indeed, I feel it must be; and, at any rate, I'm sure I couldn't get along without it.'

" 'I say, what do you think, pussy?' said her father to Eva, who came in at this moment, with a flower in her hand.

" 'What about, papa?'

" 'Why, which do you like the best; to live as they do at your uncle's, up in Vermont, or to have a house-full of servants, as we do?'

" 'Oh, of course, our way is the pleasantest,' said Eva.

" 'Why so?' said St. Clare, stroking her head.

" 'Why, it makes so many more round you to love, you know,' said Eva, looking up earnestly.

" 'Now, that's just like Eva,' said Marie; 'just one of her odd speeches.'

" 'Is it an odd speech, papa?' said Eva, whisperingly, as she got upon his knee.

“ ‘ Rather, as this world goes, pussy,’ said St. Clare. ‘ But where has my little Eva been, all dinner-time ?’

“ ‘ Oh, I’ve been up in Tom’s room, hearing him sing, and Aunt Dinah gave me my dinner.’

“ ‘ Hearing Tom sing, eh ?’

“ ‘ Oh, yes ! He sings such beautiful things about the New Jerusalem, and bright angels, and the land of Canaan.’

“ ‘ I dare say ; it’s better than the opera, isn’t it ?’

“ ‘ Yes, and he’s going to teach them to me.’

“ ‘ Singing-lessons, eh ?—you *are* coming on.’

“ ‘ Yes, he sings for me, and I read to him in my Bible ; and he explains what it means, you know.’

“ ‘ On my word,’ said Marie laughing, ‘ that is the latest joke of the season.’

“ ‘ Tom isn’t a bad hand, now, at explaining Scripture, I’ll dare swear,’ said St. Clare. ‘ Tom has a natural genius for religion. I wanted the horses out early this morning, and I stole up to Tom’s cubiculum there, over the stables, and there I heard him holding a meeting by himself ; and, in fact, I hav’n’t heard any thing quite so savoury as Tom’s prayer this some time. He put in for me with a zeal that was quite apostolic.’

“ ‘ Perhaps he guessed you were listening. I’ve heard of that trick before.’

“ ‘ If he did, he wasn’t very politic : for he gave the Lord his opinion of me pretty freely. Tom seemed to think there was decidedly room for improvement in me, and seemed very earnest that I should be converted.’

“ ‘ I hope you’ll lay it to heart,’ said Miss Ophelia.

“ ‘ I suppose you are much of the same opinion,’ said St. Clare. ‘ Well, we shall see,—sha’n’t we, Eva ?’ ”—pp. 133—136.

One more passionate outburst on the same theme from the lips of the usually easy-going and apparently unexcitable Augustine St. Clare we must also lay before our readers, as we think it will teach them more than any comments of our own could do. The high-principled but somewhat stiff Miss Ophelia and Augustine are conversing confidentially, the lady urging on the gentleman the necessity of holding decided views and acting up to them.

“ ‘ The short of the matter is, cousin,’ said he, his handsome face suddenly settling into an earnest and serious expression, ‘ on this abstract question of slavery there can, as I think, be but one opinion. Planters, who have money to make by it—clergymen, who have planters to please—politicians, who want to rule by it—may warp and bend language and ethics to a degree that shall astonish the world at their ingenuity ; they can press nature and the Bible, and nobody knows what else, into the service ; but, after all, neither they nor the world believe in it one particle the more. It comes from the devil, that’s the

short of it; and, to my mind, it's a pretty respectable specimen of what he can do in his own line.'

"Miss Ophelia stopped her knitting, and looked surprised; and St. Clare, apparently enjoying her astonishment, went on.

" 'You seem to wonder; but if you will get me fairly at it, I'll make a clean breast of it. This cursed business, accursed of God and man, what is it? Strip it of all its ornament, run it down to the root and nucleus of the whole, and what is it? Why, because my brother Quashy is ignorant and weak, and I am intelligent and strong—because I know how, and *can* do it—therefore, I may steal all he has, keep it, and give him only such and so much as suits my fancy. Whatever is too hard, too dirty, too disagreeable for me, I may set Quashy to doing. Because I don't like work, Quashy shall work. Because the sun burns me, Quashy shall stay in the sun. Quashy shall earn the money, and I will spend it. Quashy shall lie down in every puddle, that I may walk over dryshod. Quashy shall do my will, and not his, and all the days of his mortal life, and have such a chance of getting to heaven, at last, as I find convenient. This I take to be about what slavery is. I defy anybody on earth to read our slave-code, as it stands in our law-books, and make any thing else of it. Talk of the *abuses* of slavery! Humbug! The *thing itself* is the essence of all abuse! And the only reason why the land don't sink under it, like Sodom and Gomorrah, is because it is *used* in a way infinitely better than it is. For pity's sake, for shame's sake, because we are men born of women, and not savage beasts, many of us do not, and dare not—we would *scorn* to use the full power which our savage laws put into our hands. And he who goes the furthest, and does the worst, only uses within limits the power that the law gives him.'

"St. Clare had started up, and, as his manner was when excited, was walking, with hurried steps, up and down the floor. His fine face, classic as that of a Greek statue, seemed actually to burn with the fervour of his feelings. His large blue eyes flashed, and he gestured with an unconscious eagerness. Miss Ophelia had never seen him in this mood before, and she sat perfectly silent.

" 'I declare to you,' said he, suddenly stopping before his cousin '—it's no sort of use to talk or to feel on this subject—but I declare to you, there have been times when I have thought, if the whole country would sink, and hide all this injustice and misery from the light, I would willingly sink with it. When I have been travelling up and down on our boats, or about on my collecting-tours, and reflected that every brutal, disgusting, mean, low-lived fellow I met, was allowed by our laws to become absolute despot of as many men, women, and children, as he could cheat, steal, or gamble money enough to buy—when I have seen such men in actual ownership of helpless children, of young girls and women—I have been ready to curse my country, to curse the human race!'"—pp. 162, 163.

But we must hurry on to the death of the sweet Evangeline,

omitting much valuable matter : such as the record of the stern efforts made by the rigid Miss Ophelia to reform the obstinate negro child Topsy, who is so proud of her perversity, reiterating in proud confidence to her playmates, after innumerable failures on the part of her praiseworthy mistress, " White folks is sinners too—Miss Feely says so ; but I 'spects niggers is the biggest ones ; but lor ! ye an't any on ye up to me. I's so awful wicked, there can't nobody do nothin' with me. I used to keep old missis a swarin' at me half de time. I 'spects I's the wickedest crittur in the world :"—the interesting episode of the arrival of Augustine's brother Alfred with his son Henrique ; the gradual decline of the pure and heavenly child who feels so deeply the sorrows of the black race, saying, when one case of peculiar hardship has come immediately under her notice, " I'm not nervous, papa, but *these things sink into my heart* ;" her entreaty to her father to become the advocate of the rights of the black when she has departed ; her eventual reclamation of Topsy herself by the influence of pure love ; and many other admirable passages. Finally comes the closing scene, which, long as it is, we must extract : we do not think Dickens's narrative of the last days of little Paul Dombey equals it, beautiful as that is in sweetness and pathos ; this is so much more distinctively Christian, and altogether breathes higher and nobler aims, and is also more life-like, less visionary and shadowy, more earnest in every sense. Topsy has been gathering flowers for Eva's chamber ; her mother interrupts the little black girl in her task of love, chides her, and beats her.

" In a moment, Eva was off from her lounge, and in the verandah.

" " Oh, don't, mother ! I should like the flowers ; do give them to me ; I want them ! "

" " Why, Eva, your room is full now. "

" " I can't have too many, ' said Eva. ' Topsy, do bring them here. "

" Topsy, who had stood sullenly, holding down her head, now came up and offered her flowers. She did it with a look of hesitation and bashfulness, quite unlike the eldritch boldness and brightness which was usual with her.

" " It's a beautiful bouquet ! ' said Eva, looking at it.

" It was rather a singular one—a brilliant scarlet geranium, and one single white japonica, with its glossy leaves. It was tied up with an evident eye to the contrast of colour, and the arrangement of every leaf had carefully been studied.

" Topsy looked pleased, as Eva said, ' Topsy, you arrange flowers very prettily. Here, ' she said, ' is this vase, I hav'n't any flowers. I wish you'd arrange something every day for it. '

" " Well, that's odd, ' said Marie. ' What in the world do you want that for ? '

“ ‘Never mind, mamma; you’d as lief as not Topsy should do it—had you not?’

“ ‘Of course, any thing you please, dear! Topsy, you hear your young mistress; see that you mind.’

“ Topsy made a short curtsy, and looked down; and, as she turned away, Eva saw a tear roll down her dark cheek.

“ ‘You see, mamma, I knew poor Topsy wanted to do something for me,’ said Eva to her mother.

“ ‘Oh, nonsense! it’s only because she likes to do mischief. She knows she mustn’t pick flowers—so she does it; that’s all there is to it. But, if you fancy to have her pluck them, so be it.’

“ ‘Mamma, I think Topsy is different from what she used to be; she’s trying to be a good girl.’

“ ‘She’ll have to try a good while before *she* gets to be good,’ said Marie, with a careless laugh.

“ ‘Well, you know, mamma, poor Topsy! every thing has always been against her.’

“ ‘Not since she’s been here, I’m sure. If she hasn’t been talked to, and preached to, and every earthly thing done that anybody could do; and she’s just so ugly, and always will be, you can’t make any thing of the creature!’

“ ‘But, mamma, it’s so different to be brought up as I’ve been, with so many friends, so many things to make me good and happy; and to be brought up as she’s been, all the time, till she came here!’

“ ‘Most likely,’ said Marie, yawning. ‘Dear me, how hot it is!’

“ ‘Mamma, you believe, don’t you, that Topsy could become an angel, as well as any of us, if she were a Christian?’

“ ‘Topsy; what a ridiculous idea! Nobody but you would ever think of it. I suppose she could, though.’

“ ‘But, mamma, isn’t God her Father, as much as ours? Isn’t Jesus her Saviour?’

“ ‘Well, that may be. I suppose God made everybody,’ said Marie. ‘Where is my smelling-bottle?’

“ ‘It’s such a pity—oh! *such* a pity!’ said Eva, looking out on the distant lake, and speaking half to herself.

“ ‘What’s a pity?’ said Marie.

“ ‘Why, that any one, who could be a bright angel, and live with angels, should go all down, down, down, and nobody help them! oh, dear!’

“ ‘Well, we can’t help it; it’s no use worrying, Eva! I don’t know what’s to be done; we ought to be thankful for our own advantages.’

“ ‘I hardly can be,’ said Eva, ‘I’m so sorry to think of poor folks that hav’n’t any.’

“ ‘That’s odd enough,’ said Marie; ‘I’m sure my religion makes me thankful for my advantages.’

“ ‘Mamma,’ said Eva, ‘I want to have some of my hair cut off—a good deal of it.’

“ ‘What for?’ said Marie.

“ ‘Mamma, I want to give some away to my friends, while I am able to give it to them myself. Won't you ask aunty to come and cut it for me?’

“ Marie raised her voice, and called Miss Ophelia from the other room.

“ The child half rose from her pillow as she came in, and, shaking down her long golden-brown curls, said, rather playfully, ‘Come, aunty, shear the sheep!’

“ ‘What's that?’ said St. Clare, who had just then entered with some fruit he had been out to get for her.

“ ‘Papa, I just want aunty to cut off some of my hair; there's too much of it, and it makes my head hot. Besides, I want to give some of it away.’

“ Miss Ophelia came with her scissors.

“ ‘Take care, don't spoil the looks of it!’ said her father; ‘cut underneath, where it won't show. Eva's curls are my pride.’

“ ‘O papa!’ said Eva sadly.

“ ‘Yes, and I want them kept handsome against the time I take you up to your uncle's plantation, to see Cousin Henrique,’ said St. Clare, in a gay tone.

“ ‘I shall never go there, papa; I am going to a better country. Oh, do believe me! Don't you see, papa, that I get weaker every day?’

“ ‘Why do you insist that I should believe such a cruel thing, Eva?’ said her father.

“ ‘Only because it is *true*, papa; and if you will believe it now, perhaps you will get to feel about it as I do.’

“ St. Clare closed his lips, and stood gloomily eyeing the long, beautiful curls, which, as they were separated from the child's head, were laid, one by one, in her lap. She raised them up, looked earnestly at them, twined them around her thin fingers, and looked, from time to time, anxiously at her father.

“ ‘It's just what I've been foreboding,’ said Marie; ‘it's just what has been preying on my health from day to day, bringing me downward to the grave, though nobody regards it. I have seen this long. St. Clare, you will see, after a while, that I was right.’

“ ‘Which will afford you great consolation, no doubt!’ said St. Clare, in a dry, bitter tone.

“ Marie lay back on a lounge, and covered her face with her cambric handkerchief.

“ Eva's clear blue eye looked earnestly from one to the other. It was the calm, comprehending gaze of a soul half loosed from its earthly bonds; it was evident she saw, felt, and appreciated the difference between the two.

“ She beckoned with her hand to her father. He came, and sat down by her.

“ ‘Papa, my strength fades away every day, and I know I must go.

There are some things I want to say and do, that I ought to do; and you are so unwilling to have me speak a word on this subject. But it must come; there's no putting it off. Do be willing I should speak now!

" 'My child, I *am* willing,' said St. Clare, covering his eyes with one hand, and holding up Eva's hand with the other.

" 'Then I want to see all our people together. I have some things I *must* say to them,' said Eva.

" 'Well!' said St. Clare, in a tone of dry endurance.

" Miss Ophelia dispatched a messenger, and soon the whole of the servants were convened in the room.

" Eva lay back on her pillows, her hair hanging loosely about her face, her crimson cheeks contrasting painfully with the intense whiteness of her complexion and the thin contour of her limbs and features, and her large, soul-like eyes fixed earnestly on every one.

" The servants were struck with a sudden emotion. The spiritual face, the long locks of hair cut off and lying by her, her father's averted face, and Marie's sobs, struck at once upon the feelings of a sensitive and impressible race; and, as they came in, they looked one on another, sighed, and shook their heads. There was a deep silence, like that of a funeral.

" Eva raised herself, and looked long and earnestly round at every one. All looked sad and apprehensive. Many of the women hid their faces in their aprons.

" 'I sent for you all, my dear friends,' said Eva, 'because I love you. I love you all; and I have something to say to you, which I want you always to remember . . . I am going to leave you. In a few more weeks, you will see me no more—'

" Here the child was interrupted by bursts of groans, sobs, and lamentations, which broke from all present, and in which her slender voice was lost entirely. She waited a moment, and then, speaking in a tone that checked the sobs of all, she said—

" 'If you love me, you must not interrupt me so. Listen to what I say. I want to speak to you about your souls . . . Many of you, I am afraid, are very careless. You are thinking only about this world. I want you to remember that there is a beautiful world, where Jesus is. I am going there, and you can go there; it is for you, as much as me. But if you want to go there, you must not live idle, careless, thoughtless lives; you must be Christians. You must remember that each one of you can become angels, and be angels for ever . . . If you want to be Christians, Jesus will help you. You must pray to Him; you must read—'

" The child checked herself, looked piteously at them, and said sorrowfully—

" 'Oh, dear! you *can't* read. Poor souls!' and she hid her face in the pillow and sobbed, while many a smothered sob from those she was addressing, who were kneeling on the floor, aroused her.

" 'Never mind,' she said, raising her face and smiling brightly

through her tears, 'I have prayed for you; and I know Jesus will help you, even if you can't read. Try all to do the best you can; pray every day; ask Him to help you, and get the Bible read to you whenever you can; and I think I shall see you all in heaven.'

" 'Amen,' was the murmured response from the lips of Tom and Mammy, and some of the elder ones, who belonged to the Methodist church. The younger and more thoughtless ones, for the time completely overcome, were sobbing, with their heads bowed upon their knees.

" 'I know,' said Eva, 'you all love me.'

" 'Yes; oh, yes! indeed we do. Lord bless her!' was the involuntary answer of all.

" 'Yes, I know you do. There isn't one of you that hasn't always been very kind to me; and I want to give you something that, when you look at, you shall always remember me. I'm going to give all of you a curl of my hair; and, when you look at it, think that I loved you and am gone to heaven, and that I want to see you all there.'

" It is impossible to describe the scene, as, with tears and sobs, they gathered round the little creature, and took from her hands what seemed to them a last mark of her love. They fell on their knees; they sobbed, and prayed, and kissed the hem of her garment; and the elder ones poured forth words of endearment, mingled in prayers and blessings, after the manner of their susceptible race.

" As each one took their gift, Miss Ophelia, who was apprehensive for the effect of all this excitement on her little patient, signed to each one to pass out of the apartment.

" At last, all were gone but Tom and Mammy.

" 'Here, Uncle Tom,' said Eva, 'is a beautiful one for you. Oh, I am so happy, Uncle Tom, to think I shall see you in heaven, for I'm sure I shall; and Mammy—dear, good, kind Mammy!' she said, fondly throwing her arms round her old nurse, 'I know you'll be there, too.'

" 'O Miss Eva, don't see how I can live without ye, no how;' said the faithful creature. 'Pears like it's just taking every thing off the place to oncet!' and Mammy gave way to a passion of grief.

" Miss Ophelia pushed her and Tom gently from the apartment, and thought they were all gone; but, as she turned, Topsy was standing there.

" 'Where did you start up from?' she said suddenly.

" 'I was here,' said Topsy, wiping the tears from her eyes. 'O Miss Eva, I've been a bad girl; but won't you give *me* one too?'

" 'Yes, poor Topsy! to be sure I will. There—every time you look at that, think that I love you, and wanted you to be a good girl!'

" 'O Miss Eva, I is tryin!' said Topsy earnestly; 'but, Lor, it's so hard to be good! 'Pears like I an't used to it, no ways!'

" 'Jesus knows it, Topsy; He is sorry for you; He will help you.'

" Topsy, with her eyes hid in her apron, was silently passed from

the apartment by Miss Ophelia: but, as she went, she hid the precious curl in her bosom.

"All being gone, Miss Ophelia shut the door. That worthy lady had wiped away many tears of her own, during the scene, but concern for the consequence of such an excitement to her young charge was uppermost in her mind.

"St. Clare had been sitting, during the whole time, with his hand shading his eyes, in the same attitude. When they were all gone, he sat so still.

" 'Papa!' said Eva gently, laying her hand on his.

"He gave a sudden start and shiver, but made no answer.

" 'Dear papa!' said Eva.

" 'I cannot,' said St. Clare, rising, 'I cannot have it so! The Almighty hath dealt *very bitterly* with me!' and St. Clare pronounced these words with a bitter emphasis indeed.

" 'Augustine! has not God a right to do what He will with his own?' said Miss Ophelia.

" 'Perhaps so; but that doesn't make it any easier to bear,' said he, with a dry, hard, tearless manner, as he turned away.

" 'Papa, you break my heart!' said Eva, rising and throwing herself into his arms; 'you must not feel so!' and the child sobbed and wept with a violence which alarmed them all, and turned her father's thoughts at once to another channel.

" 'There, Eva—there, dearest! Hush! hush! I was wrong; I was wicked. I will feel any way, do any way—only don't distress yourself; don't sob so. I will be resigned; I was wicked to speak as I did.'

"Eva soon lay like a wearied dove in her father's arms; and he, bending over her, soothed her by every tender word he could think of.

"Marie rose and threw herself out of the apartment into her own, when she fell into violent hysterics.

" 'You didn't give me a curl, Eva,' said her father, smiling sadly.

" 'They are all yours, papa,' said she, smiling—'your's and mamma's; and you must give dear aunty as many as she wants. I only gave them to our poor people myself, because you know, papa, they might be forgotten when I am gone, and because I hoped it might help them remember . . . You are a Christian, are you not, papa?' said Eva, doubtfully.

" 'Why do you ask me?'

" 'I don't know. You are so good, I don't see how you can help it.'

" 'What is being a Christian, Eva?'

" 'Loving Christ most of all,' said Eva.

" 'Do you, Eva?'

" 'Certainly I do.'

" 'You never saw Him,' said St. Clare.

" 'That makes no difference,' said Eva. 'I believe Him, and in a

few days I shall see Him;' and the young face grew fervent, radiant with joy.

• • • • • •

"The friend who knew most of Eva's own imaginings and foreshadowings was her faithful bearer, Tom. To him she said what she would not disturb her father by saying. To him she imparted those mysterious intimations which the soul feels, as the cords begin to unbind ere it leaves its clay for ever.

"Tom, at last, would not sleep in his room, but lay all night in the outer verandah, ready to rouse at every call.

"'Uncle Tom, what alive have you taken to sleeping any where and every where, like a dog, for?' said Miss Ophelia. 'I thought you was one of the orderly sort, that liked to lie in bed in a Christian way.'

"'I do, Miss Feely,' said Tom mysteriously. 'I do, but now—'

"'Well, what now?'

"'We musn't speak loud; Mas'r St. Clare won't hear on't; but Miss Feely, you know there must be somebody watchin' for the Bridegroom.'

"'What do you mean, Tom?'

"'You know it says in Scripture, 'At midnight there was a great cry made, Behold, the Bridegroom cometh.' That's what I'm spectin' now, every night, Miss Feely—and I couldn't sleep out o' hearin' no ways.'

"'Why, Uncle Tom, what makes you think so?'

"'Miss Eva, she talks to me. The Lord, He sends his messenger in the soul. I must be thar, Miss Feely; but when that ar blessed child goes into the kingdom, they'll open the door so wide, we'll all get a look in at the glory, Miss Feely.'

"'Uncle Tom, did Miss Eva say she felt more unwell than usual to-night?'

"'No; but she telled me this morning she was coming nearer—thar's them that tells it to the child, Miss Feely. It's the angels—it's the trumpet sound afore the break o' day,' said Tom, quoting from a favourite hymn.

"This dialogue passed between Miss Ophelia and Tom, between ten and eleven one evening, after her arrangements had all been made for the night, when, on going to bolt her outer door, she found Tom stretched along by it, in the outer verandah.

"She was not nervous or impressible; but the solemn, heartfelt manner struck her. Eva had been unusually bright and cheerful that afternoon, and had sat raised in her bed, and looked over all her little trinkets and precious things, and designated the friends to whom she would have them given; and her manner was more animated, and her voice more natural, than they had known it for weeks. Her father had been in in the evening, and had said that Eva appeared more like her former self than ever she had done since her sickness; and when he kissed her for the night, he said to Miss Ophelia, 'Cousin, we may keep her with us, after all; she is certainly better;' and he had retired with a lighter heart in his bosom than he had had there for weeks.

•

“ But at midnight—strange, mystic hour, when the veil between the frail present and the eternal future grows thin—then came the messenger!

“ There was a sound in that chamber, first of one who stepped quickly. It was Miss Ophelia, who had resolved to sit up all night with her little charge, and who, at the turn of the night, had discerned what experienced nurses significantly call ‘a change.’ The outer door was quickly opened, and Tom, who was watching outside, was on the alert in a moment.

“ ‘Go for the doctor, Tom! lose not a moment,’ said Miss Ophelia; and, stepping across the room, she rapped at St. Clare’s door.

“ ‘Cousin,’ she said, ‘I wish you would come.’

“ Those words fell on his heart like clods upon a coffin. Why did they? He was up and in the room in an instant, and bending over Eva, who still slept.

“ What was it he saw that made his heart stand still? Why was no word spoken between the two? Thou canst say, who hast seen that same expression on the face dearest to thee—that look, indescribable, hopeless, unmistakeable, that says to thee that thy beloved is no longer thine.

“ On the face of the child, however, there was no ghastly imprint—only a high and almost sublime expression—the overshadowing presence of spiritual natures, the dawning of immortal life in that childish soul.

“ They stood there so still, gazing upon her, that even the ticking of the watch seemed too loud. In a few moments Tom returned with the doctor. He entered, gave one look, and stood silent as the rest.

“ ‘When did this change take place?’ said he, in a low whisper, to Miss Ophelia.

“ ‘About the turn of the night,’ was the reply.

“ Marie, roused by the entrance of the doctor, appeared hurriedly from the next room.

“ ‘Augustine! Cousin!—Oh!—what?’ she hurriedly began.

“ ‘Hush!’ said St. Clare hoarsely; ‘*she is dying!*’

“ Mammy heard the words, and flew to awaken the servants. The house was soon roused—lights were seen, footsteps heard, anxious faces thronged the verandah, and looked tearfully through the glass doors; but St. Clare heard and said nothing—he saw only *that look* on the face of the little sleeper.

“ ‘Oh, if she would only wake, and speak once more!’ he said; and, stooping over her, he spoke in her ear—‘Eva, darling!’

“ The large blue eyes unclosed—a smile passed over her face; she tried to raise her head, and to speak.

“ ‘Do you know me, Eva?’

“ ‘Dear papa,’ said the child with a last effort, throwing her arms about his neck. In a moment they dropped again; and, as St. Clare raised his head, he saw a spasm of mortal agony pass over the face—she struggled for breath, and threw up her little hands.

“ ‘ O God, this is dreadful !’ he said, turning away in agony, and wringing Tom’s hand, scarce conscious what he was doing. ‘ O Tom, my boy, it is killing me !’

“ Tom had his master’s hand between his own ; and, with tears streaming down his dark cheeks, looked up for help where he had always been used to look.

“ ‘ Pray that this may be cut short !’ said St. Clare, ‘ this wrings my heart !’

“ ‘ Oh, bless the Lord ! it’s over—it’s over, dear master !’ said Tom ; ‘ look at her.’

“ The child lay panting on her pillows, as one exhausted—the large clear eyes rolled up and fixed. Ah, what said those eyes that spoke so much of heaven ? Earth was passed, and earthly pain ; but so solemn, so mysterious, was the triumphant brightness of that face, that it checked even the sobs of sorrow. They pressed around her, in breathless stillness.

“ ‘ Eva !’ said St. Clare gently.

“ She did not hear.

“ ‘ O Eva, tell us what you see ! What is it ?’ said her father.

“ A bright, a glorious smile passed over her face, and she said, brokenly—‘ Oh ! love—joy—peace !’ gave one sigh, and passed from death unto life !

“ ‘ Farewell, beloved child ! the bright, eternal doors have closed after thee ; we shall see thy sweet face no more. Oh, woe for them who watched thy entrance into heaven, when they shall wake and find only the cold grey sky of daily life, and thou gone for ever !’ ”

pp. 209—217.

This is indeed most beautiful, so much so that all other extracts after it would read comparatively flatly, and we must hurry this long article to a close. Suffice it to say, then, that on the very day when Augustine St. Clare has resolved to live for a great purpose, the redemption of his enslaved brethren from their bondage, he receives a mortal wound in the attempt to separate two brawlers in a coffee-house, and dies, thanks to the exertions and prayers of Uncle Tom, not altogether “ without hope in the world.” Poor Uncle Tom, losing his kind master thus suddenly, is sold again (on which occasion the miseries of a slave-auction are vividly portrayed), and to the most brutal of slave-owners, a certain Mr. Simon Legree. We cannot follow the fortunes of the unfortunate yet really blessed slave, who “ possesses Christ, and with Him all things,” through the process of his cruel martyrdom. All the scenes in Legree’s plantation are painted with enormous power and vividness, and the story of the beautiful quadroon woman, constrained to be the wretch’s mistress, is awful in its truth. Legree is possessed with a cruel hatred for

the unoffending Christian Tom, and desires to debase his soul by employing him as the task-master of his brethren; failing in this design he tortures him to death, the law being utterly powerless to protect the victim, and the law-makers, it should seem, unwilling to attempt any remedy. The vision of "One crowned with thorns, buffeted and bleeding," vouchsafed to the sufferer in his utmost need, we receive, not only as a psychological fact, for which our authoress upholds it, verified by many histories, but as an actual revelation of the Lord of martyrs to his sick and failing servant. We must extract the passage. This vision comes upon the one occasion on which Tom's faith, after heroic efforts, has sunk the lowest. His nerves have been shattered by the extremity of his tortures; he no longer seems to have power even to believe with fervour. Our authoress says, "The atheistic taunts of his cruel master sank his before dejected soul to the lowest ebb; and though the hand of faith still held to the eternal rock, it was with a numb despairing grasp." But he was not deserted; rescue was close at hand.

"Suddenly every thing around him seemed to fade, and a vision rose before him of One crowned with thorns, buffeted, and bleeding. Tom gazed in awe and wonder at the majestic patience of the face; the deep pathetic eyes thrilled him to his inmost heart; his soul woke as, with floods of emotion, he stretched out his hands and fell upon his knees; when gradually the vision changed, the sharp thorns became rays of glory, and in splendour inconceivable he saw the same Face bending compassionately towards him, and a Voice said, 'He that overcometh shall sit down with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne.'"—p. 286.

Joy now floods the heart of the dying man, joy that retains dominion through all his fearful sufferings to the end. One more short extract, and it shall be our last we must make, illustrating the power of saintliness over vice. The two negro overseers, Sambo and Quimbo, who are more like brute monsters than human beings, the partners of their master's guilt, have been torturing Tom under his directions; but at last even their brutal hearts are touched by the patience of the martyr, and his gasping prayer for his murderers, in the height of his agonies, and when Legree has withdrawn, believing his victim dead, they seek to draw him back to life again.

"'Sartin, we've been doin' a drefful wicked thing!' said Sambo; 'hopes mas'r 'll have to 'count for it, and not we.'

"They washed his wounds—they provided a rude bed of some refuse cotton for him to lie down on; and one of them, stealing up to the

house, begged a drink of brandy of Legree, pretending that he was tired, and wanted it for himself. He brought it back, and poured it down Tom's throat.

" ' O Tom ! ' said Quimbo, ' we's been awful wicked to ye ! ' "

" ' I forgive ye, with all my heart ! ' said Tom faintly. "

" ' O Tom ! do tell us who is *Jesus*, anyhow ? ' said Sambo—' *Jesus*, that's been a standin' by you so, all this night !—Who is He ? ' "

" The word roused the failing, fainting spirit. He poured forth a few energetic sentences of that wondrous One—His life, his death, his everlasting presence, and power to save. "

" They wept—both the savage men. "

" ' Why didn't I never hear this before ? ' said Sambo ; ' but I do believe !—I can't help it ! Lord *Jesus*, have mercy on us ! ' "

" ' Poor critters ! ' said Tom, ' I'd be willing to bar' all I have, if it'll only bring ye to Christ ! O Lord ! give me these two more souls, I pray ! ' "

" That prayer was answered ! "—pp. 303, 304.

Perhaps some of our readers may consider these extracts too painful : but surely in purged eyes they scarcely can be so : Christians should not shrink from the aspect of that fiery trial, borne by the servants of their Lord and Master, which renders them partakers of that Master's joy ; bonds, and imprisonment, and tortures, strifes and death, borne for the Saviour's sake, will all shine, we know, as brightest jewels in the crown of everlasting glory. Yea, has not the Lord *Jesus* said, " Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven ? " But not the less accursed is the system which sanctions such horrors, not the less deserving of every good man's wrath and execration.

We have done. Let us yield what little aid we can to the great work of negro emancipation. If we can do nothing else, we can at least pray in the solitude of our chambers for the sufferers so many thousand miles away ; we can entreat the Almighty also to touch the hearts of our American brethren, and inspire them with the earnest resolution to pass such laws as shall at least render these fearful abuses of slavery actual impossibilities henceforth. We repeat that we cannot advise immediate and total emancipation, but rather the gradual redemption of the negro race, on the principles indicated by the recent testament of that great American statesman, Henry Clay. Only let not Americans content themselves with retaliations, when this their great national sin is urged on their consideration, flinging in our faces the distressed condition of large classes of our English poor. We acknowledge the fact, and regret it bitterly, but it is not the necessary consequence of our laws, or of our social institutions ;

it is not an evil that can be eradicated like slavery by a vote of any legislature ; it appears to be the result of an excess of the population over the supplies, and though Church and State may have been to blame in allowing such masses to come into existence, without endeavouring to provide for their wants, the thinkers of the age, our politicians and political economists, are altogether divided in opinion as to the best method of alleviating the condition of the suffering poor. The two cases, therefore, can in no way pass for parallels, though Mrs. Stowe seems to wish to place them in this light.

But we mean to address no reproaches to our transatlantic brethren, and to pass no condemnation on them ; we can make great allowances for the vast difficulties of their position. Let there be no enmity, no bitterness of wrath and strife, in the intercourse betwixt the two great Anglo-Saxon nations. We may both learn much from one another, in the way of example and of warning.

Here, then, we conclude. The whole world, and not only the afflicted negro race, are under no small obligation to Harriet Beecher Stowe for the work she has presented to us : yet why talk we of obligation in the case of one who has simply done her duty and discharged her soul ? Of her may be said, we trust, in the words of Longfellow's exquisite poem on the lady who, resigning all her slaves, had become a village schoolmistress :—

“ It is their prayers, which never cease,
That clothe her with such grace ;
Their blessing is the light of peace
That shines upon her face.”

They who obey the voice of conscience, will not miss their reward in this world or the next.

ART. V.—1.—*The “English Review” and Mr. Gladstone. From the “Guardian” of July 7th.*

2. *A Letter to Sir Brook W. Brydges. By JOHN KEBLE, M.A. J. H. Parker.*

3. *The Catholic Layman, for August. No. VIII. 9, Upper Sackville-street, Dublin.*

It is with a feeling of heartfelt thankfulness that we sit down to write this paper ; a feeling for which very few of our readers will be at a loss to account. Very eventful, in truth, for the Church of England, appeared the issue of the recent elections. Without endorsing, to the full extent, Lord Maidstone's *dictum*, “after Lord Derby, the deluge,” no thoughtful Churchman can be ignorant of the fact, that Lord Derby's government *may* be the one thing which stands between the Church of England and a crisis of difficulty and danger, second only to that in which she was involved during the period of the Great Rebellion. There is no doubt whatever that, should Lord Derby be driven from power, he will be succeeded by the firm of Russell, Graham, Cobden, and Co. ; a very ominous combination, indeed, for the cause of our Spiritual Mother. We watched, therefore, with great interest, the progress of the recent elections : partly, for the sake of Lord Derby himself, who, as far as can at present be judged, seems disposed to do that which no government has done for a long time past,—to give the Church of England fair play ; but, still more, for the sake of the eventful consequences to the Church, with which, in all human probability, his defeat would have been pregnant. We rejoice most sincerely in the reflection that, at all events, for the present, the crisis of danger is past. Our own opinion is, that Lord Derby's government will not simply hold its ground, but will gradually strengthen its position, so as to gain for itself, ultimately, the respect and confidence of the country. Be this, however, as it may, one thing is perfectly certain, that, should Lord Derby be driven from power by a combination of parties, there is no single party which, with the present House of Commons, can have the slightest possible hope of successfully succeeding him. Be the issue of the next session what it may, at any rate, the Church of England is, at present, saved from the persecution to which, we

have not the smallest doubt, she would inevitably be subjected, should that object of the "Morning Chronicle's" especial admiration, Sir James Graham, be placed at the helm of the State.

We purpose, in this paper, to make a few remarks on the recent elections, so far, and so far only, as they appear to affect the cause of the Church. We meddle not with general politics in these pages. We simply desire to present to the consideration of our readers, as Churchmen, a few reflections which seem naturally to arise out of the struggle in which the whole country has recently been engaged.

We desire, however, to make, at the outset, one remark. We write, in no shape or way, as *partisans* of Lord Derby's government. So far as the cause of the English Church is concerned, we pin our faith, for the future, on no man's sleeve, be he who he may. We have had a great deal too much of blind confidence in individuals. We have experienced far too much evil from such a line of conduct, ever to pursue a similar line for the future. But we do say this, that, whether we look at the constituent parts, or at the public acts of the government, so far as we know at present, Churchmen have every reason to look forward with hope to the prospect of Lord Derby's continuance in power. We will not believe, until we see it, that the cause of the English Church will be betrayed and abandoned, either by the Premier himself, or by such men as Mr. Walpole and Lord John Manners. Neither do we believe that Sir John Pakington, *pace* the "Morning Chronicle" and the "Record," is half as much tinctured with the leaven of puritanism, as those doughty champions of the "Church," each for its own peculiar ends, are so fond of describing him. We question very much indeed, whether the Colonial Secretary's name was not employed as a "stalking horse," before the last meeting of the National Society, very much more than he either warranted or desired. That Sir John Pakington, like every honourable and right-minded man, feels intense disgust at the treachery of many who called themselves English Churchmen, we can most readily believe; that, if the choice, *of necessity*, lay between Romanism and Evangelicalism, he, in common with the other members of the government, would choose the latter, we readily believe also. We ourselves would most undoubtedly do the same thing. But as, on the one hand, we happen to be of opinion that, happily, no such necessity exists, so, on the other, we state our own thoroughly independent, but, withal, thoroughly earnest conviction that, so long as the Church of England party is true to itself, so long will it meet not only with no opposition, but with every possible encouragement, from our present rulers. Thus much we have thought it right to say, because we were most intensely disgusted with the tone which the

“Morning Chronicle” and D. C. L. thought it consistent with their position as the one, the recognized organ, and the other, the acknowledged leader of the party which claims to be, exclusively, the “Church” party, to adopt, a few months back, with respect to Lord Derby’s government. We say deliberately that, *if* Lord Derby should hesitate to give effect to, as we believe, his own wishes with respect to Convocation, and other important matters affecting the Church of England, the “Morning Chronicle” and D. C. L., by their bitter sarcasms, by their direct and open hostility, in the one case with a view which no one could possibly mistake, will have afforded a most reasonable ground for such hesitation.

But to return to the more immediate subject of this paper. And first we would say a few words with respect to the election for the University of Oxford:—first, as regards Mr. Gladstone; secondly, as regards ourselves; and thirdly, with respect to a very unhappy letter of one, whom we grieve sorely to be obliged to censure, but who, we think, has done, by its publication, the greatest possible damage to the cause of Christian morals.

Now, with respect to Mr. Gladstone, loud, as our readers know, has been the shout of gratulation raised by that gentleman’s supporters, and their organs of the press, at the issue of the Oxford University election. We can only say, that, if those parties who hold the peculiar views of the “Morning Chronicle” and the “Guardian,” to which we referred in our last number, consider that election *as a triumph of those views*, they must be very thankful indeed for very small mercies! The “Guardian” has given us an analysis of the poll-book; will it give us also a list of *the neutrals*? Does it really believe that, had the opposition proceeded from a different quarter, the result would have been the same? Does it believe for a moment that, if the high-minded men who could not *conscientiously* vote either way, had been guided by the same laws of morality, which Mr. Keble has advocated, with respect to the admission of Jews into the legislature: does the “Guardian” really believe that, in that case, Mr. Gladstone would have been at the present moment occupying his present position? Thus much is all we shall say on the subject. As to Mr. Gladstone himself, we shall watch, with the deepest interest, his course in the present parliament. We allude not now to his conduct with respect to the existing government, but with respect simply to the Church of England. We do venture to hope that we shall not see any repetition of the strange and startling line he adopted on the Ecclesiastical Titles Act. We shall rejoice most heartily if our hopes and wishes are realized. Of one thing we have little doubt, that the occasion for action, one way or the other, will very

soon present itself. We are very much mistaken if many weeks of the next session are allowed to elapse without some answer, on the part of Lord Derby, to the arrogant defiance of the law of England, on the part of the Romish Hierarchy, in the recent announcement with respect to the Oscott "Synod." "We, the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster," will find, unless we greatly mistake, that if they are bent upon becoming "martyrs," the opportunity for self-immolation will soon be presented to them. We do trust earnestly that, if it be so, we shall find Mr. Gladstone siding with those who think, not that the Church of England owes her existence to acts of parliament, but that so long as she is the Church of the nation, by law established, so long, we frankly and readily admit, so long only, has she a right to expect from the representatives of the nation, in parliament assembled, that they will protect her against the wanton insolence of Romish aggression.

And now a few words with respect to ourselves. Some of our readers have probably seen an article in the "Guardian" of July 7th, headed "The English Review and Mr. Gladstone." We must say a few words on that article. And let us say, first, that we do not intend to waste either our own or our readers' time, by replying, in any shape or way, to the *sarcasm* of the "Guardian." We at once admit that, in that respect we cannot compete with our contemporary. We readily yield him the victory on that point, and—all the credit to which it may entitle him. *Palmarum qui meruit ferat.* But not so with respect to the assertions of the "Guardian." Here our good name, *or our contemporary's*, is at stake. Will the readers of our last number really believe, that the "Guardian" has ventured to describe us, as "averring, in the face of the most explicit denial by Mr. Gladstone himself, *that he is seeking a separation of Church and State* ¹?" Now, on this point, we simply say that either the writer of this article never read our paper, or else he has deliberately, for his own purposes, misrepresented it. Why, so far from an "avermment," there is not even an "insinuation," that Mr. Gladstone "is seeking for a separation of Church and State." Nay, more than this, we studiously maintained just the contrary! We said, throughout our paper, over and over again, that we gave Mr. Gladstone full credit for *not seeking* any thing of the kind. We distinctly stated that we were, throughout, combating, with very great pain to ourselves, not Mr. Gladstone's "*intentions*" but Mr. Gladstone's "*tendencies*." To prove this in detail would be well-nigh to re-write our paper. So much for the accuracy of our contemporary!

¹ The italics are ours.

We have not space or inclination to follow the "Guardian" through its other misrepresentations. We will only allude to one. The "Guardian" thinks it right to assure its readers, that it is not true, as the "English Review" asserts, that Mr. Gladstone, personally, has, or ever had, any share whatever in that paper, "nor any control or influence, direct or indirect, over what appears in it!" Now, we say, in the first place, that there is not one single word, in our last number, which gives the smallest occasion to this disavowal. We never dreamed of asserting any thing of the kind. We spoke of the "organs" of Mr. Gladstone, just as the "Times" would speak of the "Morning Herald," as the reputed organ of Lord Derby's government, and in no other way. But we beg to assure our contemporary, in the second place, that we should really never have given ourselves the trouble of even imagining, whether Mr. Gladstone had, or had not, any "control or influence, direct or indirect," over its columns. We should never have dreamed of questioning that gentleman's undoubted right to be, if he pleased, a part proprietor of the "Guardian," or any other paper whatever. Certainly, as far as our own individual opinions are concerned, we happen to think that, if Mr. Gladstone *had* invested his money in the "Guardian," he might, so far as the cause of the Church of England is concerned, have laid it out to very much better advantage²; but, in truth, we never even have thought about the matter, one way or the other; and, therefore, the "virtuous indignation" of our contemporary is sadly misplaced. It is a very admirable instance of "Much ado about nothing;" and whether the "Guardian" played "Beatrice," and Mr. Gladstone "Benedict," or *vice versa*, is a matter respecting which we should never even have dreamed of making any inquiry, still less should we have been guilty of the gross impropriety of making any allusion to such a delicate circumstance in our own pages.

But we have not quite done with the "Guardian." Our readers may remember that, in the paper to which we are now alluding, we stated our belief, that there are certain parties in the Church of England who are earnestly *desirous* of separating the Church from the State—that there are others who do not *desire* any thing of the kind, but who are yet advocating views and principles which do, in effect, tend toward the same ultimate issue. Now, the "Guardian" thinks this belief a very foolish

² While on this subject, we may say, in passing, that we have noticed, with much pleasure, the announcement of the "English Churchman," that an enlargement, and general improvement, of that paper is contemplated, if sufficient encouragement be afforded to the editor. We think such a movement very desirable, and we, very heartily, wish it success.

one. It says, "but for this article we should have thought it impossible for any reasonable man to believe that a great statesman would lend himself to so idle and chimerical a dream as the separation in this country of the connexion between Church and State. We trust we shall hear no more of such silly charges." So, then, according to the "Guardian," the notion of "separating the connexion between the Church and State" is "an idle and chimerical dream." Now, it so happened that the other day we stumbled, by the merest accident, on the following passage:—

"I still think that it would be highly for the *blessing of the Church* if she could be amicably *separated* from that which manifestly pollutes, interferes with, and clogs her full and free operation in the souls of men, *namely, the State*. But it is just because I do hold this opinion, that I think it my duty to abide in my own sphere, *so as the better to continue to help towards its fulfilment*. I think more may be done by the clergy and laity in parishes, *uniting together with one heart and mind to bring this great blessing about* (*I mean, in plain words, the separation of Church and State as at present maintained*), than by individuals gloomily departing from her."

Now, the writer of this passage was the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett. It occurs in his pastoral letter to the parishioners of Frome, but it is not taken merely from that letter. It is taken from a *most laudatory* review of that letter, which appeared in the "Guardian" newspaper of the 4th of February last. So much for the consistency of our contemporary! So much for the notion of any one seeking the separation of Church and State, being a fond invention on our part, "an idle and chimerical dream!"

But we gladly turn from the "Guardian" to one for whom we feel a very much more sincere respect, and with whom it pains us very much more to be compelled to differ. Still, we owe a duty to the Church of England, with which no private associations, however *hallowed* they may once have been, must be allowed to interfere. With that part of Mr. Keble's letter to Sir Brook Brydges, which relates to the Oxford election, we have, of course, no concern. We simply desire to notice the passages in which he justifies the course Mr. Gladstone has hitherto pursued, with respect to the admission of Jews into the legislature, a justification which, we hesitate not to say, tends directly, if practically carried out, to sap the very foundations of Christian morality. Mr. Keble supposes an opponent to put this question:—

"'You want the nation to submit itself to the Holy Catholic Church. How can you bear its admitting Jews to be part of its legislature?'"

"'For this reason,' might one reply: 'In common with all who know what the Catholic Church is, *I cannot help seeing that the*

nation is deceiving itself ; it has gradually given up its adherence to the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, and has come to insist on its own claims ; has set up itself in the Church's stead, as sufficiently endowed with Church authority by the mere circumstance of its being made up of Christians. And so all manner of mistakes are being made, the deadliest errors sanctioned, the holiest things grievously profaned, the discipline of Christ already gone, the doctrine in a fair way to go ; and men see it not, because the intruders are called Christians. It is better that we should all know what point we are really come to. This exclusion of the Jews only serves to blind well-meaning persons ; *their admission will, in fact, be no additional sin*, for the sin is already committed and the curse incurred, by the nation's refusal to serve the One True Church ; and it will be a step (please God) towards future amendment : liberties which a legislature calling itself Christian would be allowed to take with holy things, will be denied to one which acknowledges our Lord but in part. The witness of the Church will thus continue unimpaired, and the State will have a far better chance of coming to a healthier mind, and submitting itself to the Church again, than as if it were allowed to go on setting itself up in the Church's stead. For, indeed, in the latter case, the Church would be too likely to disappear altogether from the country³."

Now, there is an old saying, *populus vult decipi, et decipiatur*, a saying which is generally quoted with especial reference to the tortuous and unhappy policy pursued by another communion. We beg to ask in what single respect does that policy differ from the line of argument which Mr. Keble here endorses with his *imprimatur* ? "I cannot help seeing that the nation is deceiving itself, and therefore, because I see it, I will do all I possibly can to increase the deception !" Because the State has already incurred a certain amount of sin, therefore English Churchmen, ay, more, even *ministers* of that holy and pure faith, which sternly forbids us to *do evil that good may come*, are deliberately to justify those who *assist* the State in *adding* to the burden of its condemnation ! "The admission of Jews to parliament will be no additional sin, for the sin is already committed, and the curse incurred !" Well, indeed, might the "Guardian" say, that Mr. Gladstone "no longer holds to the principle of a *State conscience as one that can be practically enforced* ;" but we certainly never anticipated the day when Mr. Keble, of all men living, would lend his sanction to such an admission, and to the adoption of such a principle of action. Why, just apply this theory to the case of an individual, and see whither it leads us. Suppose an individual coming to a priest of the Church for spiritual counsel. He allows that he has hitherto grossly deceived himself—that his soul is already burdened with a certain amount of sin, and there-

³ Keble's Letter, pp. 5, 6.

fore, because of that admission, he is advised to deceive himself still further ! He has, hitherto, stopped short of the last step, and, just because he has done so, his spiritual adviser deliberately recommends him to take it, in the hope that the very act of plunging into the lowest depth of wickedness may be the means of reclaiming him !

But, perhaps it may be said, that the analogy does not hold good ; that the State is *not* in a condition of a penitent,—that the State does *not* admit that it has been hitherto deceiving itself,—that the State is very far indeed from allowing that “the sin is already committed, and the curse incurred.” Be it so, and what follows ? Why, surely, that it must be the bounden duty of all Christian men to do all they possibly can to *bring* the State to that condition ; and if, unhappily, there is little prospect of such a consummation, at all events, sternly and emphatically to refuse the smallest assistance in propelling it on its downward course. Such would plainly be the duty of a spiritual adviser with respect to an individual—such, also, must equally be the bounden duty of all Christian men with respect to the State.

But turn we now to another branch of our subject. We desire to make a few remarks on the results of the recent elections, as regards that section of English Churchmen, who made themselves so conspicuous in the last parliament by their opposition to the “Ecclesiastical Titles Act,” many of whom are identified, in politics, with that which is commonly known as the “Peelite” party. Over and over again have we regretted the course which those persons then pursued. Over and over again have we warned them of the inevitable consequences of that course. What has been the result ? We believe we are correct in stating that, with the single exception of Mr. Gladstone, (and, from the peculiar circumstances of the Oxford election, he can scarcely be called an exception,) not one member of the school of “Liberal Churchmen” has been able to find a seat in the new House of Commons ! There never was, in our experience, an instance of retribution, at once so just, so speedy, and so crushing, in its nature. From Mr. Roundell Palmer downwards, all, save Mr. Gladstone, are politically defunct. Not even Ireland will have any thing to do with them. Now couple this with another equally significant fact, that, in the whole list of the representation for England and Wales, not one single Roman Catholic member has been returned, with the exception of Lord Edward Howard, he being the son of one, who so recently seceded from the ranks of the Romish Church. We say that these two facts, taken together, are pregnant with a moral, which *he who runs may read*. They show, most plainly, that there is

one thing against which the people of England *set their faces, as a flint*—that they will not allow any tampering, in any shape or way, with the Church of Rome—that while, on the one hand, they are fully prepared to maintain, in its proper sense, the principles of “religious liberty,” they are not prepared to endorse that new version of it, which Mr. Gladstone, and the “Church” press, have recently adopted. We do earnestly trust that the lesson will not be lost upon those whom it more immediately and expressly concerns, we mean, the Clergy of the Church of England, belonging to a certain party. There are some, alas ! among that body, with whom it is useless to expostulate ; but there are many others who may yet, we trust, be induced to pause, ere they commit themselves irretrievably to the principles unhappily professed by those whose conduct we are now considering. They may rely on it that, *so long as those principles are thus professed and thus acted on*, any alliance with the persons who hold them, no matter for what purpose, will not only render them objects of suspicion to the immense majority of the people of England, but will most materially impair their own future usefulness in the several spheres of action in which Providence has placed them. Ay, and more than this ; such an alliance will *drive* the English people to have recourse to such men as Dr. Cumming and Mr. Baptist Noel, instead of going to their rightful teachers for the advice and instruction they are bound, by their office, to afford them. The Clergy of England may rely on it, there would have been no Hanover Square lectures on the Papal Aggression—no Exeter Hall ebullitions against “Popery”—if *they* (we speak to those whom it concerns) had taken their proper positions in their own individual spheres ; if **THEY** had spoken **THE TRUTH**, from their own pulpits, *in love* indeed, but yet *the Truth*, alike with respect to the Romish, as they are ready enough to do, with respect to the Protestant, dissenter.

And, while on this subject, we must notice a circumstance, which may, possibly, open the eyes of those whom we are now more peculiarly addressing, a circumstance which, as regards the future, is calculated to excite very unpleasant suspicions. Some of our readers are perhaps aware, that a “very pretty quarrel” has arisen between the old members of the “Irish Brigade,” and those new Irish members, who have been elected under the more immediate auspices of the Roman Catholic priesthood, among whom the editor of the “Tablet” occupies so prominent a position. Now, of course, we are not going to trouble ourselves with the quarrels of Irish members. We only allude to them for a specific purpose. We wish to call the particular attention of our readers to the following extract. It occurs in a speech

delivered by Mr. Sadlier, the member for Tipperary county, at a dinner at Carlow. It is necessary to state that, at this dinner, Mr. Lucas, the aforesaid editor of the "*Tablet*," *wiser in his generation* than many who, in this respect, might profitably learn a lesson from him, had intimated his intention of refusing all coalition, for any purpose, with the "Peelite" party in the next session, a refusal over which the "*Morning Chronicle*" very recently uttered a most piteous lamentation. Mr. Sadlier thus speaks on this point, and we call our readers' particular attention to the words he used :—

"This was not the moment," he says, "to allude to the claims of Sir James Graham and Mr. Gladstone, or any of those distinguished parliamentary statesmen whose council I and my friends, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Keogh, continually had during the efforts which we made, night and day, in resisting a tyrannical government⁴."

Now, truly, this is letting us behind the scenes with a vengeance ! Just let our readers consider, who are included among "those distinguished parliamentary statesmen" who now stand forth to the world as the leading *counsellors* of the Irish Brigade. Let them consider that, among them stands prominently forward the acknowledged leader of what professes to be the party, *par excellence*, of the Church of England ! Let them consider, further, that, in a recent article, the "*Morning Chronicle*," in whose columns the individual in question occupies so very prominent a position, openly bid for the support of Mr. Sadlier and Mr. Keogh, promising them a fair share of place and power in the event of the overthrow of the present government ; supposing, that is, Sir James Graham and the Peelite party, or rather the wreck of it, should have the luck to succeed to power in its room. We ask you, Churchmen of England, how long shall these things be ? We ask you, how long will you submit to be led by men who are openly claimed as the secret aiders, abettors, and counsellors of your most bitter enemies ; as, night and day, counselling those persons whose avowed wish and desire it is to bring the Church and realm of England under the dominion of the Bishop of Rome ? We cannot believe, until we have seen it, that Mr. Gladstone is any party to the disgraceful intrigue which is openly and notoriously in progress. We sincerely trust that it is not so ; but, be the future as it may, there stands the damning fact, unless Mr. Sadlier has palpably misstated it, that they who were then, and are now, your avowed and acknowledged leaders, were, during the session of 1851, the secret counsellors and abettors of the "Irish Brigade ;" and that, remember, with respect to a

⁴ *Morning Chronicle*, Sept. 6.

measure directly and immediately affecting the rights of the English Church—a measure whose great fault was, in the eyes of the English people, that it was not strong enough to requite the insult offered to their Church and nation. Let these men purge themselves of the charge as best they may !

But we purpose, in the next place, to make a few remarks upon a series of elections, in which the “Church” has been, most unhappily, conspicuous,—we allude to those which have taken place in the sister kingdom. Melancholy, indeed, is the spectacle of priestly arrogance, and priestly domination, there presented to us. Not, certainly, that we are surprised in any way, either at the influence which has there been so unscrupulously, we may well say, as we will show presently, so blasphemously exerted, or at the success with which that exertion has been attended. The “Catholic Defence Association,” and the Irish priesthood, may well have imagined that the time had come for a final struggle. They see Ireland gradually and quietly, but none the less surely, slipping from their grasp. They see their own flocks, as they themselves allow, the moment their feet have left their native soil, renouncing, at once and for ever, the shackles of the communion in which they were born and bred—they have been compelled to witness the humiliating spectacle of Irish emigrants entrusting the distribution of the little savings they have transmitted from foreign shores, not to themselves, but to Protestant clergymen—they see, day after day, converts from what *they* call the “old faith,” increasing around them on every side ; converts to be numbered not now by hundreds, but by thousands and tens of thousands—and it is no wonder, therefore, that they should have resolved, at this election, to “stake their all upon a cast,” to move heaven, and earth, and hell itself—we do not exaggerate in saying this—in the struggle for victory. They have, to a certain extent, succeeded ; but dearly for them has the victory been purchased—how dearly, our readers may judge for themselves, when we state, as a fact within our own personal knowledge, that a very influential Irish Roman Catholic layman stated openly, in the presence of others, “the only thing to be done for this country is for parliament to disfranchise it altogether, for it is the only way to take it out of the hands of the priests.” Of course, we quote the sentence not as agreeing with it, for *we* know, and *so do the priests*, a surer way than disfranchisement—to wit, *conversion*—but we quote it as showing, with sufficient plainness, what they have gained among their own flocks by the efforts and the weapons they have used in this unholy warfare. And now for our proofs of what we have just said. We have placed at the head of this paper, a little monthly publication, issued in Dublin, called the “Catholic Layman.” We

have done so for two reasons ;—first, because we desire to call to it, for its own sake, the special attention of our readers ; and secondly, because it contains two articles, from which we purpose to present them with copious extracts. The “ Catholic Layman ” is intended for circulation among Roman Catholics, to promote a spirit of inquiry ; and it seems to be admirably adapted for such a purpose. The present number, for instance, has a very plain but well-written paper, on the “ *novelty* of the Roman Catholic doctrine of extreme unction ; ” from which, did our space permit, we would gladly quote. Our readers will be glad to learn that this publication is admirably answering its very laudable purpose. We happen to *know* that 3000 copies are sent gratis to Roman Catholic families likely to receive it ; and that it is generally well received, and often widely circulated. We state, as a fact, that, in many instances, *one copy will circulate through twenty Roman Catholic families*. Now all this must ultimately do much good, by God’s help ; and we trust that some, at least, of our readers may be induced, at a very trifling cost to themselves, to assist in so good a work.

Now, this “ Catholic Layman ” contains two articles of especial import—the one, on the Irish elections, of which we *know* the details to be authentic ; the other, a most admirable letter from Archdeacon Stopford to Dr. Cantwell, the so-called “ Bishop of Meath,” upon the election for that county ; at which Mr. Lucas, the editor of the “ Tablet,” was triumphantly returned. From both these articles our readers will gladly see extracts. And first let us see how far clerical domination was carried at the recent Irish elections:—

“The most striking fact,” says the “ Catholic Layman,” “ in the Irish elections, has been the manner in which the Roman Catholic clergy have interposed to control the choice of the electors. We feel that little proof of the fact is required, as most of our readers must be well aware of it from their own observations.

“The Roman Catholic clergy have claimed for themselves the right of choosing the representatives, wherever they had any chance of being able to effect it by any means.

“ It would be ridiculous to give long proofs of so notorious a fact ; so we give but a few—‘ Meath, in *her* *priesthood*, sat in calm council, and selected as her representative,’ &c. (Letter of the Rev. Mr. Kelsh, a priest in Meath.—*Tablet Newspaper*, July 31.) Here it was the priests *only* who met to choose the representative ; and ‘ Meath ’ is said to have made the choice, as if it were the exclusive right of the priests to act for Meath, the laity having nothing to do but to obey, and, therefore, not being consulted in the matter. And accordingly we find Mr. Lucas and Mr. Corbally both acknowledging the power by which they were returned, in the following words :—

“ ‘ For sending him (Mr. Lucas) to parliament, *the bishop and clergy of Meath* deserve and enjoy the gratitude of the Catholics of the empire.”
—*Tablet*, August 7.

“ ‘ The number of votes recorded in his (Mr. Corbally’s) favour amounted nearly to two thousand, *and for those he was indebted to the bishop and the Catholic clergy.* . . . If it had not been for the clergy HE WOULD HAVE BEEN BEATEN.’—Speech at Meath election, *Tablet*, July 31.

“ Take again the great county of Tipperary—

“ ‘ It is well known that it is the priests of Tipperary, *and the priests alone*, who can and will gain a triumph over the enemies of freedom, in *this great county*, at the coming election.’—*Tablet*, July 10.

“ And Archbishop M’Hale, at the Galway election, expressly recognizes and approves of it—

“ ‘ No doubt the clergy of Ireland are very much responsible for their share in the result of the contests now waging through the land.’—*Tablet*, July 24⁵.”

But we said that the Irish priests moved “heaven, and earth, and hell,” to settle their ends. Let us see whether this is true also:—

“ The means taken to carry into effect such elections are equally notorious. The priests having made their choice, were prepared to maintain that their choice was the choice of God, and that it was an offence against God to vote against their men.

“ We give one or two instances at random of the manner in which the priests have used their spiritual powers to force their candidates on electors.

“ An influential priest at Tralee is reported to have said:—

“ ‘ Let me suppose one of THESE WRETCHES (those who would not vote as he bade them) prostrated by sickness—suppose the hand of death heavy upon him, and a messenger came to me to attend him in his dying moments. If there were no other priest in the way I would be bound to go. I dare not refuse to attend. But I confess, *I would be sorry in my heart* to be called on to attend the death-bed of such a being. . . . *I could have no hope of converting a heart so hardened, so lost to every sense of duty and religion, as to vote in support of those who would trample on the Lord of Hosts.*’

“ We have no doubt that Father M—— would attend, with the usual alacrity of a Christian minister, at the death of any person guilty of *any other sin*, and would not be without hope of converting him. Such dreadful sentences are reserved for political disobedience to the priests at elections.

“ In the town of Westport the following placard was carried in a procession at which many priests were present:—

“ ‘ Whoever votes for a supporter of Lord Derby’s government, votes

for the massacre of his countrymen, *the violation of the house of God, AND THE POLLUTION OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF HIS REDEEMER.*'

"We should not quote such placards as the work of priests, were they not countenanced by the highest authority. At the Galway election Archbishop M'Hale spoke as follows:—

"'If you wish that your chapels should be wrecked, that your priests should be flung into prison, that **THE GOD OF HEAVEN**, under the form of bread and wine, should be exposed to blasphemous insult, as he was on a late occasion, you will support Lord Derby's government⁶.'"

Our next quotation shall be for the especial benefit and behoof of the "Morning Chronicle," which has, over and over again—in a manner utterly disgraceful to a journal of any civilized country—dared to accuse Lord Derby of being the immediate cause, not simply of the Stockport riots, but of the fearful massacre at Six-mile Bridge:—

☞ "Of course," says "Cthe atholic Layman," "all this refers to the party fight at Stockport. Lord Derby is accused of getting up that fight. It is an old and a good rule, that when any persons are suspected of having wilfully contrived a wicked action, it should be considered *who could profit by that act, and who has taken advantage of it*. Those are the persons most likely to have instigated it; and not the persons whose interests it was most likely to injure. Now, mark this; scarcely a priest who spoke at the late elections but brought forward this party fight as the most effectual thing to support his cause. Not one supporter of Lord Derby's government did so. We challenge attention to this. Every one said that this occurrence was the *most injurious thing that could have happened* for Lord Derby—that it was just the thing to give a handle to his enemies, and to do him no good. By every rule of common sense, if any one was to be suspected of getting it up, or instigating it, it was those who have been so industrious in using it as their chief instrument in carrying out their views at the elections. For ourselves, we think the angry passions of ignorant men are the proper explanation of such scenes; and we make no doubt that the guilty on both sides will be impartially punished by the law. In the mean time the occurrence has been made use of by the priests as a handle for putting forward all their spiritual power for controlling men's political conduct⁷."

But turn we now to Archdeacon Stopford, and let us learn from him what the priests have gained by the elections:—

"It is true," he says, "the county of Meath is made for the present a close borough, to which you can nominate whom you please, however flagrantly your nominee may misrepresent the feelings of the county. Yet even such a power may be purchased too dearly.

⁶ Tablet, July 24. pp. 90, 91.

⁷ Tablet, July 24, p. 91.

“If you reflect upon the feelings you have called forth in the minds of all the leading Roman Catholics of this county—Prestons, Barnewalls, Husseys, Farrells, Cruises, Plunketts, Delanys, and a whole host of respectable Roman Catholic electors of the middle class—you may well say, ‘One more such victory, and I shall be undone!’”

“If you consider the lesson you have given to Protestants, that no services rendered to your Church and cause can secure the gratitude of yourself and your clergy,

“If you consider how you have divorced the cause of your church from all association with the names that shed a lustre upon Irish history,

“If you consider what a wound you have inflicted upon the just national feelings of Irishmen in your selection of a nominee to be forced upon this county,

“If you consider the effect which the conduct of yourself and your brethren for the last two years has had upon English Roman Catholics, in making the Emancipation Act a nullity in England, Scotland, and Wales (from all which but one Roman Catholic has been returned), thus depriving them of their fair and just share in the representation of the country,

“If, I say, you consider all this, in a time of solemn reflection, you may well doubt whether you have not paid too high a price for the privilege of returning, as a member for Meath, a man who will be a mere cypher in parliament, powerless to redress the real grievances of the country, because no possible British minister will dare to accept his support—powerless to advance even the interests of your Church, because his very presence in parliament will be the most fatal argument against it.

“If you had witnessed the scenes that passed in Kells at this election—if you had seen the filthy and disgusting insults to which all respectable Roman Catholic voters were subjected—if you had seen the filthy treatment bestowed at his own door, on that Roman Catholic in Kells, whose charity and exertions for our poor have been most admirable (Mr. Flood’s political opinions and mine are sufficiently different to make this just testimony to his worth above all suspicion)—you would tremble to think how nearly the violation of political gratitude is connected with the extinction of all private gratitude, all social virtue, all sense of civil liberty, every thing that makes a people worthy of respect or admiration.

“If you had seen your priests, some acting as check clerks in public polling booths, some like constables or bailiffs in the streets, seizing by the collar Roman Catholic voters at the door of the tally-room which they wished to enter, and dragging them with violence through the street to the tally-room which they wished to avoid, you would tremble to think how you had lessened the respect of the people for a sacred character and calling.

“Or if you could now hear how every respectable Roman Catholic in Kells expresses his deep disgust at such doings, and such scenes, you

would fear lest this desperate effort to override every thing good and honourable in the feelings of your own people, may not prove the last fatal blow to your political power. Be assured, right reverend sir, that multitudes are now inquiring whether religious liberty can be really supported by a system of civil tyranny in the hands of spiritual men; multitudes are now inquiring why politics should not be left to the laity; and many Roman Catholics are considering whether the clergy of all persuasions should not be restrained by law from taking part in elections, except only by giving their own votes. It is not for me to interfere with the consideration which Roman Catholics around me are giving to this subject, except by venturing to offer the willing consent and support of the clergy of my own Church to such a law, as it may apply to ourselves¹."

But the letter of the Archdeacon opens up a very much more important question than the mere conduct of Irish priests, or the results of that conduct. A charge is very frequently brought against the Romish religion, that it will, for its own purpose, connive at and encourage the most barefaced violation of the most solemn oaths. Now, we may state for ourselves, that while we felt it impossible, as theological students, to ignore the existence of a great variety of passages in the works of Romish divines, wherein this doctrine is plainly and nakedly enunciated; still we never could from a principle, we fear now, of foolish charity, ever bring ourselves to believe that, in the nineteenth century, any man, or any set of men, could bring themselves deliberately to act upon it. It was reserved for Mr. Lucas to show us the folly of our conviction, and thus it happens. At a meeting at Kells, held on Saturday, June 13th, Mr. Lucas, having been introduced to the meeting by the Romish priest of the parish, thus addressed the electors. Archdeacon Stopford quotes the passage from Mr. Lucas's own paper, the "*Tablet*:"—

"The next thing Father M'Evoy drew my attention to, is the subject of the Established Church * * * 'By the blessing of God in heaven, I will never rest nor cease my exertions, as long as I am in any position to exercise any public functions whatever, until that accursed monopoly, the Established Church, BE CUT DOWN BY THE ROOT.' And how this was to be done he explains further on; when speaking still of the same subject, he says—'We must try to put your discontent into the form of an ACT OF PARLIAMENT; at least we will have a good fight for it.'

"There is no mistake, sir, about this, for it was published by Mr. Lucas himself, in his own paper, the *Tablet*, of June 21. And you will not deny that Mr. Lucas goes to parliament, as member for Meath, pledged to use his vote and influence as a member of parliament, for the total overthrow of the Established Church; and that this is one of the

¹ *Tablet*, July 24, pp. 92, 93.

chief grounds upon which you and your priests have returned him. Of course, sir, you read the *Tablet*, and so you were aware of all this. Your priests were well aware of this too, for I believe more than twenty of them were present and heard it; and one of them, the Rev. Mr. Kelly, of Kilsuire, in speaking after Mr. Lucas, said 'he believed, in his inmost soul, in the sincerity of his (Mr. Lucas's) promises, and his ability to carry them out.' You yourself wrote a letter to Mr. Lucas two days after that speech was delivered (which letter is also published in the *Tablet* of June 21), in which you thus state your directions to your priests,—'after maturely weighing the talents, HONESTY, and efficacy of the various candidates,.....It is, I conceive, the duty of the clergy to explain their views to the electors of their respective parishes,' &c., and you express your own 'cordial concurrence' in their choice of Mr. Lucas. It is, therefore, clear that you and they have chosen Mr. Lucas as member for Meath upon this, as one of the chief grounds of your choice, that he is prepared to vote in parliament for an act for the total abolition of the Irish Church establishment, and for the confiscation of its property; and so far from denying this, you and others will perhaps wonder why I take so much pains to prove so plain a fact⁹."

Now, as our readers are aware, every Roman Catholic member of parliament is obliged, by the Act of '29, to take, before admission, a certain oath. That oath is as follows; we quote it, with Archdeacon Stopford's comment:—

" 'I DO SWEAR that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement of property within this realm as established by the laws; and I do hereby DISCLAIM, DISAVOW, AND ABJURE *any intention to subvert the present CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT as settled by law within this realm*; and I do solemnly swear, that I never will exercise any privilege to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the United Kingdom; and I do SOLEMNLY, IN THE PRESENCE OF GOD, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever; so HELP ME GOD¹.'

" 'By the blessing of God in heaven (says Mr. Lucas in Kells) I will never rest nor cease my exertions until the Established Church be cut down by the root, and we must put this in the form of an act of parliament.'

" 'I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and ABJURE any intention to subvert the present Church establishment, as settled by law within this realm—so HELP ME GOD.' So SWEARS Mr. Lucas in parliament."

Now, the Archdeacon writes to Dr. Cantwell to inquire what course *he* intends to take in this matter. It is an old saying, that "the word of an honest man is his bond." If Mr. Lucas be

⁹ *Tablet*, July 24, p. 93.

¹ *Ibid.*

an honest man, he is *pledged by his word* to "subvert," by every means in his power, the Irish Church; while, if he takes the oath, he is *sworn on the Gospel* not to subvert it." What says Archdeacon Stopford?—

"What follows next? Which is Mr. Lucas to *keep*—his *promise* to the priests in Meath, or his *oath* to God in parliament?

"This, right reverend sir, is the question which I put to you. Mr. Lucas's conscience is in the direction of you and your priests. You and your priests obtained this promise from him. You and your priests send him to parliament to take this oath. It rests with you, his spiritual guides, either to reconcile the promise and the oath, or to instruct him which he is to keep and which to violate.

"Let me here remind you that the question is not what is to be done by a man who has taken an unlawful oath, believing it to be lawful. There may be some very few cases, in which such an oath ought not to be kept, when a man discovers that that oath which he believed to be lawful, and which he intended to keep at the time he took it, is indeed unlawful. But this is not Mr. Lucas's case. *He has not taken the oath yet.* He has time enough to consider, and you have time enough to instruct him, whether the oath is lawful or unlawful. If that oath be unlawful, or contrary to the interest of your Church, then your own canon law says it is *a perjury* TO TAKE it; but if it be lawful, then, when taken, it would be a perjury to break it. The question is, will you sanction his taking a wicked oath, an oath which your own law says it is a perjury to take—will you sanction his doing this as a means of deceiving heretics, and violating the solemn conditions of the Emancipation Act, or will you sanction his breaking a lawful oath?

"If you will not do either the one or the other, I submit that you must instruct him that the pledge which he gave at the meeting at Kells is unlawful and cannot be kept.

"If you should give him no direction on the subject, I submit that you are answerable for the sin of allowing him to keep his pledge and violate his oath.

"If you should be silent on the subject, it must be supposed that you *will not* condemn this use of oaths, while you *cannot* defend it. In that case, Roman Catholics may be led to doubt how far they can trust in the religious teaching of those who cannot venture to avow and defend their doctrine on the plainest moral obligations²."

Now we fear that our readers will be scarcely surprised to find that Mr. Lucas, having perused Archdeacon Stopford's letter, has expressed his deliberate intention of both keeping his pledge to the electors of Meath, and, at the same time, of taking the Roman Catholic oath at the table of the House of Commons! We can only say that, if he does, he will, morally, have the guilt

² Tablet, July 24, p. 93.

of PERJURY as fully on his soul, before the throne of God, as any wretch who ever expiated that crime by exposure in the pillory, or by transportation to a foreign clime. We declare that we well-nigh sicken as we write, to think that "such things should be." We do earnestly trust that this question will not be allowed to rest where it does. Surely, some high-minded gentleman can be found to bring it fairly before the House of Commons and the country. Let Mr. Lucas be asked distinctly, whether he took the oath with the intention of *keeping his pledge* to the electors of Meath, and if he answers in the affirmative, we would have him expelled by a solemn vote of the House, as a disgrace alike to humanity, to his country, unhappily for us that country is England, and to the religion of which he professes to be a member. If some notice be *not* taken of the question, then, farewell for ever to the honour and the integrity of the British House of Commons.

And now we must say a few words on a subject which excites in all quarters, as well lay as clerical, the very greatest anxiety;—we need hardly say that we speak of CONVOCATION. We shall speak at more length elsewhere on this subject. But we would here treat on one or two questions of interest. What course will the Archbishop take? Will Lord Derby advise the QUEEN to issue the royal licence? These are questions which are now pretty nearly engrossing the attention of Churchmen of all shades of party, and of all ranks—questions, therefore, which it is incumbent on us to discuss in detail. Let us consider them separately. And, first, with regard to the Archbishop of Canterbury. We have heard it rumoured, and from a quarter likely to be well informed, that His Grace still inclines towards the adoption of a similar course to that pursued last year—that he is still most averse to convocation proceeding to exercise any active functions. Now, we venture, with all respect, to hope, that, before convocation shall assemble, the Archbishop will have read with sufficient clearness the "signs of the times," to induce him to modify this opinion. We may venture to speak on this subject with the more confidence, because, while on the one hand, we have never hesitated to express our opinion, frankly and freely, with respect to the Archbishop's course of proceeding, on this or any other subject, we have yet, on the other hand, never allowed ourselves to join in that storm of abusive and sarcastic vituperation with respect to him in which certain parties have taken such especial delight. We think, as we have always thought, that the tone adopted towards the Archbishop by these parties has been simply disgraceful, as concerns them individually, and most prejudicial to the cause of which they profess to be

such staunch supporters. On this ground, then, perchance, any suggestion we may offer, may not fall altogether unheeded on the ear of him whom we now especially address ; whom, much as we have differed from him, we have always considered as desirous, heartily and sincerely, to advance, in his high station, what he considers to be the real welfare and the real interest of the Church of England. We would, then, venture, with the greatest possible respect, to remind His Grace, that there are times when it becomes every man's bounden duty to allow circumstances, as they occur, to *modify* opinions, which have been heretofore most strongly and most conscientiously entertained. There are times and seasons when "consistency" altogether loses its character, and degenerates into a quality of a very different nature. And more than this. If a person is, by the circumstances of his position, put in the possession of a certain amount of power—if he is able, by the mere accident of that position, to put a negative upon the efforts of others—then, assuredly, if passing events are not allowed their due and proper influence, "consistency" may very soon and very easily degenerate, not simply into obstinacy, but into the most extreme and the most unsupportable *tyranny*. Now, apply this to the case we are considering. We are most decidedly of opinion, that, up to the present moment, no one has a right, we say it avowedly and deliberately, to *blame* the Archbishop for the course he has hitherto pursued with respect to convocation. We differ from him with respect to that course very decidedly, but, inasmuch as we believe that it was pursued, not from mere caprice, or love of despotic power, but as the result of earnest and deep conviction ; therefore do we say again, that no one has a right to *blame* the Archbishop for the adoption of that course, unless, indeed, they who do so are prepared to say that he alone, of all men, is not entitled to hold an opinion of his own. The Archbishop might, not altogether unnaturally, refuse hitherto to be convinced, that the representative body, elected five years ago, expressed accurately the wishes of their constituents. He might say, and, considering his own well-known opinions, we should scarcely wonder at his so saying, that there was not *sufficient* evidence of a desire, on the part of the clergy of the English Church, that convocation should meet for the purpose of actual and real deliberation. Thus much with respect to the past. But we say, most decidedly, that such a plea cannot be urged with respect to the future. No man, who has studied the recent proctorial elections, *can* possibly doubt the fact, that there is a vast majority returned in favour of the assembling of convocation for active business. For years past the question has been discussed. It has been mooted in every

possible way. In every diocese throughout the kingdom, due notice was given of the election of proctors. The question was solemnly asked, "Do you, the clergy of England, say ay or no, that you desire the assembling of convocation for actual deliberation?" And that question has been solemnly and most decidedly answered in the affirmative. To say, with certain parties, that the recent elections do *not* represent the opinions of the constituent body, is most dishonest. It is the application of a principle to matters ecclesiastical, which those very parties would be among the first in scouting, if applied to secular matters. It is, in point of fact, an absolute ignoring of the whole principle of representative election. Even supposing the clerical constituency not fairly represented, which we do not for a moment allow, still, until the next election, we have only to deal with the present admitted fact, that the great majority of proctors are elected on the distinct understanding that they will do their best to restore the active functions of convocation. That, for the present, is the only fact, so far as it goes, which the Archbishop ought to consider. To his most earnest consideration, with the greatest possible respect, we now commend it.

But the Archbishop may perchance say, that, while, on the one hand, admitting the truth of all we have just stated; while most desirous of complying, as far as possible, with the wishes of his clergy, he dares not, in this instance, sacrifice his own conviction, from a sense of the danger which, in so doing, he foresees to the future of the Church of England. Now, let us consider this point; and first, we would say, with all respect to His Grace, that his own individual opinion ought not to be allowed to influence his conduct, to so great an extent, on the present question. In ordinary cases, a man is bound to act according to the dictates of his own conscience; but in this case, the Archbishop occupies a very peculiar position. If he acts solely on his own conviction, he thereby directly nullifies the convictions of many thousands of his clergy, many of whom are, from their station and character, most unlikely to come to a conclusion prejudicial to the real welfare of the English Church. If the Archbishop were at the head of secular instead of ecclesiastical affairs, his course would be plain and easy. If a prime minister takes one view of a subject, and the people of England take an opposite view, what is that minister's obvious course? If he thinks that the representatives do not accurately express the opinions of the country, he sends them to their constituents to ask their opinion; but if, when the representatives assemble again, they still adopt the same course, then *cadit quæstio*. The question is settled; the minister either bows to their decision, and *acts upon it*, or else he

resigns his office: he never dreams of running counter to the decidedly expressed wish of the English people. Now, if the Archbishop will apply this chain of reasoning to himself, as the spiritual head of the English Church, he will surely see a sufficient reason, why he may, in the present case, without any sacrifice of principle, gracefully yield his own opinions in deference to the decidedly expressed wishes of those over whom he presides.

And now turn we from the Archbishop to Lord Derby. And, at the outset, we think it right to assure our readers, though possibly the announcement may be unnecessary, that we write without the smallest knowledge of Lord Derby's intentions on this or any other subject. We are the holders of no cabinet secrets. We merely, as in the case of the Archbishop, are desirous of laying before our readers one or two considerations, which may very possibly suggest themselves to the mind of Lord Derby, in respect to the advising or non-advising of the issue of the royal licence to convocation to proceed to exercise its active functions.

Now we desire to observe, in the first place, that, with respect to this matter, Lord Derby stands in a very different position from the Archbishop. The only question which the one ought, in our opinion, to ask himself, is, "what do the clergy say through their proctors?" But the other is compelled to ask himself, "what will the *people of England* say on this question?" According to the present practical working of the English constitution, the prime minister is, in fact, the embodiment of the popular voice. Whatever may be his own private opinion on this or any other subject, he is compelled to ascertain also how the current of popular feeling runs with respect to it. Well, then, let us suppose that Lord Derby is desirous of coming to a practical conclusion with respect to the very important subject we are now discussing. Our readers will see presently, that, in discussing it, we ourselves also are desirous of arriving at a *practical conclusion*. Suppose then Lord Derby sets himself to consider the present position of the *English clergy*, with respect to the question of convocation. What does he find? He finds this: that the desire for convocation proceeds exclusively, with very few, if any, exceptions, from that which is commonly known as the "High-Church party." But when he comes to analyze that party, he finds that there are two sections of it, and that one section has rendered itself most unhappily conspicuous; first, as being the body from whence have gone out all those persons who have, within the last few years, joined the Romish communion; and, secondly, as containing within it, and especially in its lay element, many who

advocate the theory of "religious equality," who support a system which, if fairly and legitimately carried out, must terminate—let the "Guardian" say what it will,—must terminate in the separation of Church and State. This is one side of the question. Now turn to the other, the side of the people, and what will Lord Derby find? He will find this: that the people of England have shown, at the recent elections, the most decided, and the most uncompromising hostility to every theory, and every principle, with which the extreme section of the "High-Church party" is more peculiarly identified. The people of England have shown their utter abhorrence of every thing connected with Romanism or Romanizers: they have shown, also, that they will not adopt the theory "of the political equality of all religions," that they will have nothing whatever to do with those who uphold it. But this is not all. Lord Derby will find this fact in addition, that the very men, by whom the question of CONVOCATION is most clamorously and most prominently pressed upon his attention, *are identified with the particular party to which we are now referring.* Mark, we are not alluding now to the clerical constituency in general, but we are speaking of those by whom they have, so unhappily, allowed themselves to be led; of those whose views and opinions are promulgated, day after day, in the columns of the "Church" press. We are stating facts, with respect to which we defy contradiction. Well, then, what will necessarily follow? Why this, that Lord Derby, supposing him disposed to do the Church justice, is placed, by the act of the "Church" party itself, in a very obvious dilemma—a dilemma from which he may very fairly ask that that party shall extricate him, for they, and they only, have the power of doing so. Now, then, for our practical conclusion. We say to the clergy of England, that, so long as matters remain as they are, they have no right to expect that Lord Derby will comply with their wishes with respect to convocation. So long as they will consent to place themselves under the guidance of men who will persist in *euphemisms* with regard to Rome and Romish perversions,—so long as they will allow themselves to be identified, no matter in what way, or on what question, with those parties who hold the particular views on which we commented in our last number—so long as this is the case, *so long are they themselves the main obstacles to the revival of convocation*, because they render it utterly impossible for any government, from fear of public opinion, to place confidence in them. We warn them that a grave responsibility now rests upon them. There is yet time to remedy our present unhappy position. Let those whom we are now addressing take their stand upon these three grand principles—

unswerving fidelity to the Church of England—uncompromising resistance of Romish insolence and Romish ERROR—a stedfast determination to uphold the alliance between Church and State—let them steadily refuse, no matter at what sacrifice of personal associations, to have any thing to do with those who will not openly and decidedly avow and act upon these principles—and all will, in the end, we verily believe, yet be well. Let them stop short of this, and no effort they can make will be of the slightest avail towards the recovery of the Church's freedom. So, and so only, can they possibly hope to secure to themselves the respect, and the confidence, of the English people.

And let it not be supposed that, in what we have said, we are aiming at any particular individuals—that we are desirous of thrusting out any one from co-operation with ourselves, in labouring for the welfare of our Spiritual Mother. We declare solemnly it is not so. There is no single individual with whom we would refuse to co-operate, provided he will avow, and act upon, the principles we have just mentioned. But, we say also, that with no one, be he who he may, who falls short of them, will we have any thing whatever to do, in matters affecting the Church. We are most firmly persuaded that no efforts whatever, which are not in complete accordance with these principles, are either, in themselves, based upon a proper foundation, or have any, the remotest, possible chance of ultimate success. We pray God, most earnestly, that what we have said may have its due weight with those whom it more immediately concerns.

And now, before we conclude, we are desirous of stating, briefly, what presents itself to our view as, on the one hand, the duty of the Church with respect to the government—and, on the other, the duty of the government towards the Church. There are two virtues, then, which, it seems to us, it is especially desirable that English Churchmen should exercise, at the present time, with respect to Lord Derby's government—we mean *hope* and *patience*. Without being, as we said in the outset, *partisans*, in any sense, of Lord Derby, we still venture to say this, that, so far as present appearances go, Lord Derby has given more evidence of possessing the essential characteristics of a CHRISTIAN STATESMAN, than any minister who has, for years past, presided over the government of this country. It is long since we have witnessed the gratifying spectacle of a prime minister manfully and openly avowing his entire dependence on that gracious Being by whom “kings reign and princes govern”—it is very long since we have heard a great statesman speak of the Church and her especial attribute, the work of education, as Lord Derby spoke in the House of Lords, on the 27th of last February. Thus eloquently did he

avow his determination to uphold the cause of revealed religion and of the Church of CHRIST :—

“ But when I use the term ‘ education,’ do not let me be misunderstood ; I do not mean by education the greatest development of the mental faculties, the mere acquisition of temporal knowledge, and mere instruction—useful as no doubt that may be—which may enable the man to improve his condition in life, may give him fresh tastes, and give him also, by this means, the opportunity of gratifying those new tastes and habits. Valuable as such instruction may be, when I speak of education I speak of this, and this only—education involving the culture of the mind, the culture of the soul, and the laying of the basis and the foundation of all knowledge upon a knowledge of the Scriptures and of revealed religion. I desire to look upon all those who are engaged in the work of spreading education, even though they be of a different opinion to that to which I am sincerely attached, rather as fellow-labourers than as rivals, in the warfare against vice and irreligion. I will say nothing which can be offensive to any of those who differ with me in opinion, or who belong to other communities ; but I must say that, for the promotion of education and of religious knowledge, I will rest mainly on the exertions, the able and indefatigable exertions, of the parochial clergy of the United Kingdom. My lords, I hold that the Church, as the depositary of what I believe to be the true religion, is the instrument of incalculable good here, and of even greater and more incalculable good hereafter. My lords, I say it is not only the interest but the duty of Her Majesty’s government to uphold and to maintain it in its integrity, not by enactments directed against those who differ from our communion, not by virulent invective or abusive language against the religious faith of those whose errors we may deplore, but to whose consciences we have no right to dictate ; but by steadfastly resisting all attempts at aggression on the rights and privileges and possessions of that Church, come from what quarter and backed by what weight of authority they may be ; by lending every power of government to support and extend the influence of that Church in its high and holy calling of diffusing throughout the length and breadth of the united empire—I speak not of this country only—that knowledge which is derived from the diffusion of the Holy Scriptures³. ”

And so, listen to the peroration with which he concluded, and then say whether we are not justified in the remarks we have just made :—

“ For my own part,” he says, “ when I look to the difficulties that surround us, when I look to the various circumstances that must combine to give us a chance of successfully encountering the various obstacles that beset our path, I confess I am myself appalled by the magnitude of the difficulties that we have to encounter. But I believe, and

³ Morning Chronicle, Feb. 28.

I know that the destinies of nations are in the hands of an overruling Providence. I know that it often is the pleasure of that great Being to work his own objects by weak and unworthy means. In his presence I can solemnly aver that no motive of personal ambition has led me to aspire to the dangerous eminence on which the favour of my Sovereign has placed me. In the course of the discharge of those duties no considerations shall sway me except those which led me to accept it—the paramount consideration of public duty; and with that feeling on my mind—that deep conviction of the sincerity of my own motives—and that trust in the guidance and blessing of a higher Power than my own, I will venture to undertake the task from which I might well have shrunk appalled by its magnitude. And, be the period of my administration longer or shorter, not only shall I have obtained the highest object of personal ambition, but I shall have fulfilled one of the highest ends of human being, if, in the course of it, I can have, in the slightest degree, advanced the great objects of peace on earth and good will among men, and the social, moral, and religious improvement of the country—if I can have contributed to the safety, to the honour, and to the welfare of our Sovereign the Queen ‘.”

Of course we are perfectly aware that this *may all be* the veriest “clap-trap,” a mere “blind” to enlist the sympathies of credulous supporters. We need not to be told that, when Lord Derby speaks of the “Church,” he *may possibly* allude, not to that *mystical body of CHRIST*, which is *the pillar and ground of the truth*, but *may* merely consider her as a thing of human growth, as “existing by Act of Parliament,” as “an establishment of earth’s creation.” We are quite sensible of this fact, that when he speaks of “revealed religion,” Lord Derby *may* allude, not to the dogmatic teaching of the Christian Church, but merely to the barren faith of a cold, and naked, and *negative* “Protestantism.” We know perfectly well that such things *may be*, but we do not ourselves, for a single moment, believe that such things *are*. We believe, rather, that as Lord Derby’s personal character is above all suspicion, so Churchmen may fairly interpret his language and sentiments, according to the plain and obvious signification which appears on the face of them. And, thus believing, we say again that, without any blind adhesion, any indiscriminate confidence, English Churchmen may now look forward with hope to the prospect of Lord Derby’s continuance in power.

But we say also that, with this “hope,” it is essentially necessary that “patience” should be joined. *Supposing* Lord Derby to be ever so well disposed towards the Church, still it must be remembered that he will have many very great and very pressing

difficulties against which to contend. If we have reason to hope for justice to the Church, we must still allow Lord Derby, to a certain extent, the liberty of choosing his own time for its administration. For example, *supposing* that Lord Derby cannot see his way clearly towards granting the royal licence to convocation immediately on its first being assembled. Of course, in that case, certain parties, *who have their own ends to forward*, will be ready directly to cry out that Lord Derby "has betrayed the Church," that "all his fine professions go for nothing," &c. &c. Now, *we would say*, rather, that, as we gave Lord Derby credit for good intentions, and as he must have better means than we can have of knowing the proper time for action, therefore, we should be disposed to believe that he would have good grounds for any course he might adopt; therefore, we should be content to allow *a reasonable time* for carrying those good intentions into practical operation.

And now let us see what is, as we humbly conceive, the duty of the government with respect to the Church. We say *duty*, because we are desirous of taking into account the very highest motive of action, but most sure are we that, as in every other case, so especially in this, duty and interest would go hand-in-hand together.

We would venture, then, to suggest to Lord Derby one or two considerations, which a "Christian Statesman," and such we believe him to be, who desires to win the *confidence* of Churchmen *must* take into account. We say then, first, that he *must* consider calmly and dispassionately the mighty movement which has been going on for the last twenty years, within the bosom of the Church of England. It is absolutely impossible—it is beyond the power of any man, or any set of men—wish it howsoever they may—to repress that movement. They may ignore it, if they will. They may pass it by with cold contempt and frigid indifference, as a thing with which they have no concern. They *may* do this; it is what has been hitherto done; but, in any case, repress it they cannot. And if this be so, what is the plain duty of a "Christian Statesman?" Why, surely, not to "ignore," but to "head" the movement—to direct and guide it, permitting its legitimate development, but checking any tendency to extravagance. We would say that there are, at the present time, three principles actively at work in the English Church. The one, the "ultramontane principle," which regards the Church as an institution, existing, not simply independently of the State, but as being, in its essence, something directly above it—which repudiates State connexion and State alliance, because of certain evils which, it is said, flow necessarily and immediately out of them. Another is

the "Erastian" principle, which looks on the Church as existing by the fiat of the civil power, and therefore, of course, depending on the civil power for its continuance. A third is the "Anglican" principle—a principle which regards Church and State as equally and alike God's instruments for promoting the welfare of mankind—which regards the Church as perfectly independent, as to its essence, of the civil power, but as best fulfilling the will of its DIVINE FOUNDER, when in alliance with it—which considers it the duty of the State to protect, and foster, and cherish the Church—the duty of the Church to respect and co-operate with, in all lawful things, the civil power. Now, twenty years ago, he who had used such language as this, would have spoken in an "unknown tongue" to the great majority of English Churchmen. The "Erastian" principle was then dominant. Men talked of the "establishment," as if to be "established" were the very essence of the Church, absolutely ignoring its divine and inherent qualities. But it ought not to be so, and, God be thanked, it is not so now; and any "Christian Statesman" who, aware that it is not so, yet shuts his eyes to the fact, and quietly passes it by, pursues a very absurd, nay, we hesitate not to assert, a very sinful course. But here we gladly avail ourselves of the remark of a contemporary writer, who has sketched, with a masterly hand, the influence which the religious movement of the last twenty years ought to produce on the mind of a "Christian Statesman."

"We have seen, then," it is said, "partially, at least, what our difficulties are, as a Churchman views them, in connexion with the State. But there is another aspect of affairs which it concerns us to contemplate, if we desire to form a correct and impartial judgment of our present circumstances. It is not only the Church and her members who feel troubled and perplexed in consequence of her relations to a distempered State, but the State and its ministers, be it remembered, have scarcely less embarrassment to encounter in consequence of its alliance to a distracted Church. Let a Christian statesman be never so well disposed, let him consult with all the wisdom and energy of a true patriot for the welfare of the Church, and he will scarcely fail to disoblige, even of professing Churchmen, as many as he will please. Desiring to account for this phenomenon, and to surmount, if it may be, the difficulties which it occasions, he will take a calm view of his position in relation to the Church. Over against the secular wants which we have above described, and partly, it may be said, arising out of them, a no less remarkable series of Ecclesiastical occurrences will appear before him. He will see a movement going forward which threatens to assume the shape of an *imperium in imperio*, and in the absence of a legitimate vent, which wise and friendly administrations would have found for it, to transfer to minor Dignitaries and to Voluntary Societies the influence and authority which properly belongs only to the Episcopate and to

Convocation. In seeking to trace the origin of this movement, he will discover that its motives were good and laudable, as its principles were sound and well-defined : the former, zeal for God's glory and the rescue of a beleaguered Church ; the latter, reverence for primitive antiquity, and fidelity to the Reformation. He will find that in its course it has drawn within it, more or less visibly, whatever of learning, or taste, or genius, or sanctity, or self-devotion, has appeared amongst us. He will observe how, like the scribe instructed into the kingdom of heaven, it has brought out of its treasures things new and old ; and how the literary works it has achieved deserve to be admired, not more for their intrinsic merits than for their variety and extent, as forming altogether a stupendous monument of industry and zeal. He will confess, that by restoring order and propriety to public worship, and by multiplying the daily use of Common Prayer, it has conferred blessings upon the land which no man who calls himself a Christian will venture to gainsay. All this and more of permanent and incalculable good he will (if he examines fairly) ascribe to a movement, which, at the same time, he will know has placed all its authors and chief promoters under a ban, and has exposed them, if not to open persecution, to an extraordinary degree of suspicion and dislike. Nor will he wonder, when he looks more closely, that such should be the case. It required a bold and Catholic-minded minister at the first to take the movement by the hand ; or, on the part of the men themselves, a sturdy indifference to coldness and neglect, and a deep-rooted confidence in the impregnable strength of the position which they came forward to maintain. Unfortunately the former was not found in the government either of the Whigs or of Sir Robert Peel ; and the latter was no less signally wanting in more than one of those whom we delighted to honour as our champions and our guides. Increased alienation aggravated the evil upon either side. The movement became more and more unsound in proportion as the State neglected to secure its services ; and the State justified at once its suspicion and neglect by the frequent apostasies which its own mistaken policy had engendered in the movement. If the constitution of the State is no longer what it was in relation to the Church, so neither, it must be confessed, is the attitude of those who claim (and without reason) to represent the Church, what it was towards the State ; if the former has drifted from its original moorings, so, too, have the latter. How, then, must a Christian statesman be perplexed when he sees the change which has come over us—a change which no alteration of circumstances, no amount of prejudice or discouragement, could suffice to justify—our natural friends converted into foes, and our foes into friends!—no language sufficiently gentle towards Rome, or too galling and opprobrious towards the Civil Power !—when he marks how much treason, openly vented against the principles with which the movement set out, if not actually encouraged amongst us, has been allowed to pass unrebuked!—when he looks out upon the sea, which we had undertaken to defend, and of which every cross current, every rock and shoal, had been carefully laid down in

the charts of former navigators, literally *strewn with wrecks*, which have been caused, not by any sudden storm or unforeseen attack, but solely by the wilfulness and incapacity of the mariners themselves¹!"

Now, this is a very true and graphic feature of the present position of the High-Church party, including, under that term, both the sections into which that party is, unhappily, divided—such are really the effects of the great movement which has been going on in the English Church during the last twenty years.

But it may possibly be said, "how can you expect any government to 'head a movement' which has produced such effects—within which such influences, as you here describe, are actually at work?" We reply that, assuming of course the movement to contain elements of good, which this undoubtedly did, such a step would be a simple measure of *justice*—since, inasmuch as those effects are, to a certain extent, the results of coldness and neglect on the part of the State, therefore the State is bound to repair that neglect by its future conduct. But we say, moreover, that these influences, evil as we admit them to be, are really diffused over only a comparatively small section of the High-Church party. We are most firmly convinced that the great majority of that party are untainted by the peculiar views of the extreme section. It is perfectly true that they have, as we have shown above, most unhappily allowed the most active members of that section to take the lead among them; but we are firmly convinced, that it is in the power of any government, which will deal fairly, honestly, and impartially with the English Church, to dissolve that connexion at once and for ever. Lord Derby may rely upon it, that the vast majority of the clergy and laity of the English communion will rally around him as one man the moment they see him beginning to act up to the principles he has already so eloquently professed. Let him show that he regards the Church of CHRIST, as GOD's own heritage, as the *Vineyard which God's right hand hath planted*;—let him show that he considers it the highest privilege of a Christian Statesman, not to *break down the hedge* of that vineyard—nor to *pluck off her grapes*—not, as the *wild boar out of the wood*, to *root it up*, as a *wild beast of the field*, to *devour it*—but rather to *fence it*, and *gather out the stones thereof*, and *plant it with the choicest vine*;—let Lord Derby show, by his ecclesiastical appointments, that he is desirous of promoting men of earnest piety, without reference to party;—let him show that he will allow no considerations of political expediency to influence him in any way, when dealing with aught connected with

¹ Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal, p. 174.

the Church;—let him show his consciousness of the great truth, that Churchmen will not be contented any longer with “shams,”—that the days of careless indolence, and worldly ease, and callous indifference, the days when men were content to fatten on the emoluments of the Church, without doing her work, are gone for ever;—let Lord Derby take such a course as this, and it is our earnest conviction that, by the adoption of that course, he will do very much indeed to place his government on a secure and permanent footing. Any how, we are sure of one thing, that in so doing, be the result what it may, he will satisfy the dictates of his own conscience—that in so doing, he will earn for himself the glorious character of a Christian Statesman—that in so doing, he will best perform his duty alike to his God and to his country.

ART. VI.—*Original Views of Passages in the Life and Writings of the Poet-Philosopher of Venusia: with which is combined an Illustration of the Suitability of the Ancient Epic and Lyric Styles to Modern Subjects of National and General Interest.* By JOHN MURRAY, M.A., &c. &c. Dublin: Hodges and Smith.

AT the present moment a contest of almost unexampled bitterness is raging at the other side of the Channel in reference to classical studies in general; and so hotly and vehemently is it pursued by bishops, archbishops, abbés, monks, professors, and journalists, who appear to be equally divided on the question, that one party accuses the other of heresy, while the other retorts the charge of infidelity. We presume this noisy and angry controversy will die away after a time, and leave matters pretty much as it found them. To exclude the classics from schools and seminaries would be impossible in a communion where Latin is still so extensively used in all ecclesiastical affairs. Nor, indeed, can it be possible in any system which seeks to cultivate the taste by the study of the best models, or to develop the faculties through the medium of the highest philosophy. The value of the classical writings is only, amongst ourselves, disputed by those who are unacquainted with them; while, at the same time, it must be admitted, that much serious evil to morals has arisen from the careless and indiscriminate study of the classics, and from the coarseness and sensuality which, in many cases, disfigure their pages, and which ought in all cases to be removed.

The volume before us is a gratifying evidence of the high range of classical attainments in the University of Dublin, from which it proceeds. We would note especially a Latin poem at the conclusion, which appears to us deserving of the highest admiration. It is on the "Regia Natalitia;" and might almost have been composed by the Bard of Venusia himself. Mr. Murray's criticisms on Horace are always ingenious and acute, if not in all cases satisfactory, and we are indebted to him for biographical notices of the poet, which will be most acceptable to all critical students of his pages.

We may add that the volume before us is not intended for junior students of Horace. There is no lack of works adapted to their use, thanks to the labours of such men as Mr. Kerchever Arnold. The facilities, indeed, now afforded for the

study of the classics, would have elicited many a groan from the pedagogues of a former generation could they have foreseen them.

Are such productions evidence of our continued or increased value for learning? They undoubtedly prove our increased love of teaching; but are all these helps to study a sign that the power has increased with the desire for acquiring classical knowledge? These scaling ladders for youth rather show, we fear, a disposition to take by storm, than the intention to enter in by patient mining. We do not now "sit down before the fortress;" we attempt it by a *coup de main*. To publish a fine scholarly edition of one of the great classics, with scholarly notes and remarks, is indeed a proof that this age is not unworthy of its predecessors. To avail ourselves of the erudition, without the overlaying superabundance of our German neighbours, shows at once our liberality and our sense; but when we see a page of works "adapted to the use of schools," and "Preparatory Lessons," and so forth, and then another page of the same sort, and then another, we are inclined to believe that the rising generation must be, instead of extraordinarily clever, as they think themselves, most remarkably dull. Drudgery, independent of the end of the drudgery, is a fine thing in itself. "Boys will be boys," and therefore that they may be men, boys must work. And when we see what great men have been great scholars, we rejoice that, by whatever means, to be a scholar, is still a necessary of life to an Englishman. The idleness of genius is now an exploded idea; when we come to look into the history of men of genius, we find how hard they laboured; and from the days of Demosthenes till now, distinction is only to be attained by fair drudgery. Drudgery will not make genius; but to make genius available, it must have laboured at the preparation; and whatever is to be the destination the youth is to have, whatever is the part he is to "play in the after game of life," it must be from "a childish thought" that has been "pleased" with the great actions of antiquity. For this reason, the earlier our intimacy with the greatest begins, the better. Familiarity does not in this case breed contempt, because with our earliest associations with Homer, Pindar, and Sophocles, we have also the early associations of youth, and hope, and happiness. At fifteen we remember the miseries of the Latin grammar, but at fifty we remember only the jokes, the fun, the joyousness of our school-days; and our recollection of the Pythian Games are so blended with those of cricket, that in the distance all looks equally bright, and hoar antiquity is gilded by the morning sun. For this reason we have always felt that this hoar antiquity should be as

hoary as possible; that the towers we are to venerate all our lives, the land marks in the waste of time, should be the greatest monuments of the human mind, and we have always regretted that Horace should be so strenuously studied. If we could look at Horace with unprejudiced eyes, we should perceive his unworthiness to be placed on the same level with Homer and Pindar. We would not have him as much read, and he is often more than any other of the classic course; so much so, that it is hard to divest ourselves of our well-taught respect for him—to ourselves peculiarly so—It seems ungrateful—heartless, to forget the pains that were taken to instruct us in him; we never can forget the light which dawned upon us on entering the fifth form, and coming under the great man's own eye—The life with which each phrase became instinct—How the words which we had been so long looking at in the boggy lower atmosphere, came at once in these rarefied regions to have a visibility of meaning of which we had not dreamed below. The allusions, the references, the multitude of ideas which could be spun out of a single passage, amazed and enchanted us. What a long revolving train of historic remains were wrought out to our awakened minds! Augustus and Imperial Rome, and Rome a republic, and the whole fabric of Roman polity, customs, laws, and religion, and all their still existing influence on European society, were all certainly opened to our view, by the best of teachers, in our course of Horace. And yet we do not consider ourselves as the worst, or the most ungrateful of scholars for depreciating this very Horace, and for the very reason that he did afford such copious references. Had he possessed original genius, we should have studied him only, or our annotations would have been with reference only to his genius. When we read Shakespear, we may glance at a note to see what the meaning of an old word may be in modern English, but we hurry on with the poetry, and when we think of him, it is of Shakespear, not of Shakespear's times. In fact, most of Horace's productions are mere *vers de société*. He was essentially a man of society, a man of the world. And we have "advisedly" used a French phrase in speaking of him, because we think he is so much more suited to French than to English taste. This may seem a paradox when we at the same time assert that Horace has maintained his place in English schools in a great measure from our familiarity with him from Pope's paraphrases. But it is not a paradox; both assertions, if we consider them, will prove to be true and uncontradictory. Boileau was, according to Plutarch's system of parallels on the Chart of Biography, exactly on the parallel of Horace in ability, allowing for the difference in the age and the country. But

Pope was of a different calibre. In his imitation of Horace, there is nothing of the original but the good sense, in which he is equal, while he is as inferior from his malignity, as he is superior by his wit and versification. Pope had none of the bonhommie of Horace. He was of a feeble body and irritable mind. Horace appears to have been eminently equable in his temper, possessing much of the French philosophy of temperament, much of their springiness under misfortune, and much of their knowledge of business in the midst of their frivolous pursuits, and the same power of rising superior to the loss of fortune, though knowing so well how to manage it while in possession; and very French, too, the mediocrity of his style, the borrowed nature of his by-way of grand thoughts, and the easy turns of his company verses; while Pope was, to the last degree, peevish under crosses and revengeful of wrongs, miserly as to money, and discontented as to position. There is in Horace, in spite of his flattery, a dignity which made him the real friend of the great men of whom he was independent; while in Pope there is a constant alternation of assertions of his scorn of courts and of his cringing to courtiers. He was, therefore, in his want of temper and want of dignity as unsuited to enact an English Horace as could well be, and yet he is, and ever will be considered as such, from the grace, the ease, the admirable wit and sense of his satires. The memory of the individuals may pass away, but the pictures of human nature, of corrupt society, will remain for ever. And when we read Horace, we have recourse to the commentators to tell us why such and such a passage should be admired because of its allusions to such and such an event, or such and such a character. Pope's epigrammatic lines are so general as to be quoted for ever from their intrinsic truths, epigrams being, or rather epigrammatic writing meriting, a criticism exactly the contrary of Johnson's on Pope's epitaphs; he censures them as epitaphs without a name, without individuality, "epitaphs to let;" whereas satires, which are a series of epigrams, should be without individuality; they should be universal. Boileau was not only much more fit than Pope to be the imitator of Horace, by his French bonhommie disposition, but from the style of his society and the situation of his court. The court of Louis XIV. was much more like that of Augustus than what we are pleased to call our Augustan age. Under Anne and the first and second George we were under a government settled certainly and peaceful, but held under a precarious tenure, and eminently constitutional; that is to say, the farthest possible from absolute. We were gradually recovering from the double deluge of fanatic purism and infidel profligacy. The impress of Cromwell and

of Charles II. were still on the forms of society; and in our struggles against power and puritanism we were in as opposite a state as possible from the calm belonging to the "bon tyran" Augustus, a state much more resembling the meridian of the great Louis's days. The rudeness of the stormy part of his early reign, and the disappearing race of ancient cavalier nobles, with their country castles, and vassals, and chieftain feelings, and Montaignish simplicity, and hardihood of character, was not unlike the decayed republican gentry who melted away with their republican feelings under the slow-consuming supremacy of the first emperor—the invisible, gentle, unperceived, enveloping act of despotism which gathered all into its invincible folds, gradually crushed all in one common servitude, as Louis XIV., with his magnificence and his arts, brought all France to Paris, and all her nobility to be *petit-maitre* slaves. In Pope's original poems we see at once the superiority of his country and of his genius. In the Essay on Man, he nearly approaches Lucretius, *the* Latin poet. There is nothing in Horace, we think we can prove, of real genius. It is not the fashion to read Pope, and his measure palls on the ear, but his sense and his genius are too much interwoven in our literature to be forgotten while it remains. May not the same be said of Horace? Are not his lines quoted? Allusions to him occur in every writer, and a man is thought a scholar who can repeat a line of Horace. It is precisely against this integrating of his mediocrity into our literature that we deprecate. It is from this blind delusion that we would awaken our countrymen. It is to open their eyes to their own deception, that we would turn their studies from the inferior to the true great; we would leave very little of our school and college course to Horace, and give the time so misspent upon him to the master minds, the real geniuses of antiquity. It has been said that "the elegant negligence of Anacreon, the daring and magnificent sublimity of Pindar, and the plaintive melancholy of Simonides, alternate in the Odes of Horace." We are ready to admit his graceful negligence; it is his chief merit; we join unreservedly in our admiration of his domestic pictures, his

—— "ligna super foco
Large reponens, atque benignius
Deprome quadrum Sabina."

His—

"Quis non te potius, Bacche pater, teque, decens Venus?"

and the Bore—

"Accurrit quidam notus mihi nomine tantum,
Arreptaque manu, Quid agis, dulcissime rerum?"

are admirable—they are exactly the style in which his merit appears, and to which we maintain he should have confined himself; to which, at least, our admiration should be confined. The journey to Brundisium from “Egressum magna me accepit” to the “finis chartæque viæque,” is the perfection of the *vers de société*, which are written by a gentleman about town. We can fancy the glory of being the first to recite them, the question of “Have you seen The Journey?” “Have not you had Horace’s last!” and the handing about and the copying. There was some satisfaction in those days in copying—every thing was not in print as soon as it was thought. What advertisements were there? “In hand,” we suppose, instead of “in the press,” appeared for some time, but where? In writings like “Try Warren’s Blacking” on the walls? or in affiches stuck up? Or had they arrived at our height of civilization in having walking general advertisers? It does not appear that criers went about as with our “Report of the Trial,” or “Last Dying Speech and Confession,” calling out “the Newest New Satire of Quintus Horatius Flaccus.” Was there a blessed interval between these advertisements and the actual sale in which the privileged few, like those gifted with the private *entrée* at court, could see the precious work before every body could—when they could, like the “Athenæum” or “Literary Gazette,” review the work before it appeared, pronounce upon its character before it was alive, and decide its fate before it had begun its career?

It has been argued whether Horace produced his pieces singly or all together: but it hardly admits of any question. Bentley, indeed, with his usual dull ingenuity, contends that he wrote a whole set of Satires at once, all his Satires and all his Epistles *de suite*; when the very essence of each Satire is its individuality. They were all evidently poems on several occasions. The privileged few, were probably allowed to see the tablets after the “*sæpe stilum veritas*” had been often enough repeated, before the scribe had copied them. The less favoured but more boasting, the “bustling Botherbies” of those days, had a reading of the scroll volume before it was consigned to the booksellers; where—

“Vertumnum Janumque, liber, spectare videris:
Scilicet ut prostes Sosiorum pumice mundus.”

and the book was common to all the world—the being able to say, “I saw it in the tablets,” being equivalent to the pompous whisper of “I saw the MS.,” and he who could remember a line or two, or who had made a stolen copy, being for a few days to enjoy the short-lived glory of repeating or handing about in the coteries, as a great favour, what every body could see for them-

selves three days after. The descriptions of all this sort of society, and all the good-humoured satire of his remarks, are Horace's great and in our opinion only real merit. The coarseness and disgusting nature of some of his allusions are not his fault, but those of his time, and are not so startling to our taste as those of Pope and Churchill. We class among his occasional pieces the "Apology to Augustus;" the first epistle of the second book, his answer to the Emperor's polite reproaches for not immortalizing him as his patron. It has all the graceful flattery of a dedication, and the deference of a courtier, with the calmness and ease of an independent man of the world. And to the time and the persons alluded to in these lighter poems, the greatness of Augustus and the age when he lived, one of the most remarkable eras in the history of the world, is the care with which they have been preserved to be attributed. They were written in a very marked time—they were new of their kind, and they were of that species to be particularly popular in such courts as those of Augustus and Tiberius; every body would have a copy, and as no violent commotions took place for a considerable time after they were thus well known, there were copies enough to preserve them, they were multiplied in the colonies; we suppose it was as much a necessity of fashion to have a copy of Horace in the Roman colonies as it was to have a Waverley novel in the United States. A pro-consul stationed at Seville did not think himself genteel unless he could write to Rome a line of Horace—the poet who "did" poems that the emperor read. This is all very natural, but that unprejudiced moderns who can read Pindar, should continue to call the Odes of Horace sublime poetry is very puzzling. The fact is, moderns are not unprejudiced, we have still some of the colonial feeling; we think it ungentleel not to admire what was admired in the Augustan age. And we forget how little they had then of their own to admire: Horace's Odes were new; they were intended to be in Latin what Pindar and Alcæus had produced in Greek, and were cried up accordingly. The thirty-seventh of the first book is imitated from the—

Νῦν χρὴ μεθύσκειν, καὶ τινα πρὸς βίαν
Πίνειν, ἐπειδὴ κάτθανε Μύσιλος·

of Alcæus, but how wretchedly inferior is it! The very attempt to imitate in so inferior a language shows a strange incapacity for any true feeling of admiration for his original; and yet it seems unjust to accuse an author of copying at once because he does, and because he does not admire an original: and yet it is so; Horace could perceive the glories of the Greek odes, but he

could not perceive his own inability to attain their grace and force. He had a material to work with which he could not fashion to the form he admired: it was a striving against nature, and here with a beautiful model and a noble subject he has clearly proved the bad material and the inferior power with which he worked. Cleopatra was as fine a subject for the ode as could be chosen: the enchantress queen, whose spells had so subdued the heroes and the kings that came within her magic influence. This fascinating enchantress, this mighty queen of nations and of hearts, Horace compares to a gentle dove or swift hare pursued by a hawk over the snowy fields! A simile so laughably unsuited to the subject and so absurd in itself, so thoroughly *cockney*. Similies of a hawk, a pigeon, and a hare, occur perpetually in Greek poets, and Horace thought a simile should be introduced; but what did a gentleman about town know of hares or hawks? and he therefore sets his hawk a running through the snowy fields—for unless the hawk ran, what have the snowy fields to do in the matter? “*Fatale monstrum*,” is a feeble attempt at a grand expression. Her grace and her charms, not her wickedness or her grace and charms so wickedly employed, was the thing to be expressed; the “*fatale*” is wrongly applied and “*muliebriter*” is very harsh, and though the last lines from “*Ausa et jacentem*” to the end appear to be fine, they are utterly unworthy of the subject. It is a failure not only in its execution, but in its object; to exalt the loss of such a captive to the triumph of Augustus should surely have been his purpose, but the glory and the powers of Cleopatra are unaccountably omitted—one of the strongest proofs of our position, that Horace was only a verse-maker, not a poet. We know what a true poet made of the character in Antony and Cleopatra, but then Shakspeare had the advantage of the drama; we are speaking of what could have been done in an ode. Even in these concluding lines, though sounding, and though from “*vultu sereno fortis*” we expect a description of the final scene; yet what is there? In Homer and in Pindar a word, a line, brings before our eyes the whole living picture: here all is vague, and we only know that Cleopatra died by the venom of a serpent. A true poet would have brought her at once before our eyes—we should have seen her on her couch, we should have beheld the poisonous asp applied, we should have now the mortal paleness gaining on her features, and should have had before us this queen of pomp and pleasure cold and stiff, a lump of lifeless clay. But Horace is contented to mention the bare fact, and to tell us that her body imbibed the black venom; but the bare fact would have been less inconsistent than the abortive attempt at particular description.

In short, it is a most Pindaric subject most un-Pindarically handled.

Of the lyric measure in the Latin language, we will speak by-and-by, but let us now consider his great work, *the Ode*, "The Carmen Sæculare:" we will take it by itself, as it is usually printed, for by our own theory of the occasional nature of his writings, we cannot agree to Sanadon's very ingenious supposition that—

" Odi profanum vulgus et arceo :
Favete linguis : carmina non prius
Audita Musarum sacerdos
Virginibus puerisque canto,"

was the introduction, and then making the performance last three days: the first beginning with (Car. iv. 6)

" Dive, quem proles Niobea magnæ
Vindicem linguæ,"

and ending with "Lævis Agyieu;" on the second day (i. 21) "Dianam teneræ dicite virgines," to the end; and on the third the actual "Carmen Sæculare," followed by the remaining stanzas of the "Dive, quem proles Niobea," for which arrangement there is not a shadow of evidence, and it seems a very daring procedure to cut poems to pieces in this way, and put a head here and a tail there, and then say, "what a rare beast is this!" But we are content to take the "Carmen Sæculare" as we find it in the existing MSS. of Horace, and as the most accredited editions give it, and begin with

" Phœbe, silvarumque potens Diana."

And in the first ten lines, the invocation, where the first power should appear, there is neither solemnity nor piety: the word "potens," in the first line, is in itself feeble, because it is too general; and "decus," in the second, is feebler still—"a credit to the skies," is the notion it must give; or even if we consider it as "grace," it is but a poor compliment, and how exceedingly flat is the

" possis nihil urbe Roma
Visere majus."

The Fates should have brought forth the sublime, if it was to be brought out—the not only superhuman but super-deity force of the Fates—and it was so intended; but what is there sublime either in the idea, or the rhythm, or the force of the words? How inferior to the sublime Homeric Destiny! "Veraces cecinisse" is harsh and hissing. "Semel" is a very trivial word; it has no—

thing of the immutable force that was required in describing fated dooms, and "servat" is so evidently pitiful that the critics have tried to change it for "hæret," which, though a stronger and more startling word, can hardly bear the construction. What can be less religious than "Roma si vestrum est opus?" It is not the

Κλῦθί μεν, Ἀργυρότοξ', ὃς Χρῦσιν ἀμφιβέβηκας,
Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην, Τενέδοιό τε Ἴφι ἀνάσσεις,

of Homer, which does not imply that the cities might have come by nature, but humbly reminds the deity of the protection he had afforded. In a prayer the doubt is not of the power of the deity, it is of the prayer being acceptable. And although "Romam si vestrum opus," taken with the whole passage, is only an interrogative assertion, it is not the tone of prayer. "Anchisæ Venerisque sanguis," is a mere genealogical fact. Anchises and Venus are put together as we might say John and Joan. In any mention of a deity in poetry, it should be with a solemnity which is a part of poetry: but in a religious ode the mentioning Anchises as the father of Æneas, and Venus as the mother, without even an epithet to mark her as a goddess, is, to say the least of it, indecorous, but it is contrary to the rules of art, which are only rules that spring from sense and feeling. To produce a high and solemn impression in speaking of the descent of his nation's founder, seems but a simple necessity in such a poem, and yet it is here totally overlooked.

"Jam mari terraque manus potentes
Medus, Albanasque timet secures :
Jam Scythæ responsa petunt, superbi
Nuper, et Indi,"

are noble lines, fine in sentiment and grand in rhythm. The next are spirited too, but how lame the end,

"—— apparetque beata pleno
Copia cornu."

To address Apollo as "Augur" is very irreverent. He was the patron of divination, the source of prophetic fury, the voice which spoke in oracles, the instructor of sacrificial rites; but to call upon him as a soothsayer is a mockery. We set off coldly, and we get no warmer after working up to the end; we have nothing grander to say than

"—— Meliusque semper
Proroget ævum."

And in the concluding lines the whole collected gods who should have been the finale, come first, and Apollo and Diana after

them. He began with, and therefore he concludes with them—a sort of rule perfectly in accordance with what we consider the author to have been, a verse-maker; a rule totally at variance with those rules which belong to nature, and which would have been followed by our author, had he been, what he is called, a true poet. Here are seventy-five lines on the most noble subject for a poet to attempt, and in these seventy-five lines there are six which are really rhythmical, and which contain one fine thought. So much for the Pindaric sublimity of Horace. Let us look at any ode of Pindar's of about the same length—the 11th Pythian, for instance:—

Κάδμον κόροι, Σέμελα
Μέν 'Ολυμπιάδων ἀγνιάτις.

How many noble thoughts, how many sublime images does it convey! There is a grandeur and a grace in the ὦ παῖδες Ἀρμονίας, which shows at once the master mind; while the ὄφρα Θέμιν ἱερὰν Πύθωνα, though in the simplest words, has all the dignity of a religious address. But in comparing Horace with Pindar we are treating him with an injustice, and imputing a presumption to him that he does not deserve. The fault is in his admirers; he himself was well aware of his inferiority, his

“ ——— ceratis ope Dædalea
Nititur pennis.”

And it was impossible that he could write of the deities with the solemn devotional feelings of Pindar. It is absurd to read his “Carmen Sæculare” as a religious poem. Augustus was, with his usual policy, desirous to keep up the popular superstitions, and to show how he revered the national worship. But though he and his courtiers might wish for propriety's sake to keep up a bowing acquaintance with Jupiter and the rest, they were all of a very impious turn, and hence the attempts at pious sublimity come so poorly off. We have, therefore, dwelt on them only to expose the absurdity of producing them as specimens of grand poetry.

Let us try his powers in this ode to Pindar, where he is not hampered by gods and goddesses that he does not care about. Here should be fervour, and spirit, and poetic thought—and is there? His first description of the rolling torrent of Pindar's poetry, much as it has been praised, is at once tumid and flat, “notas ripas” being a particularity that has nothing to do with the simile, and “immensus” being a generality that conveys nothing to the mind. But

“ Seu deos, regesque canit, deorum
Sanguinem,”

is fine versification and a grand description of a poet's powers. It is a noble verse, while the rest of the summary of the Pindaric subjects is but a summary, without grandeur of rhythm or one spark of the fire he is lauding.

“—— pugilemve equumve
Dicit,”

is wretchedly poor. “Dicit” has no force, and

“—— centum potiore signis
Munere donat,”

is equally spiritless. He does not tell us how these noble poems wrought upon himself. He merely repeats, as a catalogue, of what they consist. He does not imagine what was the mind that produced these gorgeous descriptions. He tells us that such were described, and goes on to tell how he went himself so laboriously to work, a fact of which he had before made us perfectly aware unconsciously in every line we read. Here is one of the greatest poets that the world ever saw to be eulogized and described, and five and twenty lines are employed, in which there is *one* worthy of the subject.

Let us now try his powers as a philosopher: we will take the first Epistle to Mæcenas, v. 11:—

“Quid verum atque decens curo et rogo, et omnis in hoc sum :
Condo, et compono, quæ mox depromere possim.”

Here he tells us that he hoards and puts together moral precepts which he can draw forth when he wants them. And hence we should expect a philosophical essay in verse on morality; but, prejudiced as we are in favour of these epistles by Pope's splendid paraphrases, yet we must at once give up the philosophy; the utmost this can claim is to be called philosophical satire. It is a satire. It at once and in itself shows the nature of the man. He was a man of the world; neither a poet, in the true sense of the word, nor yet a philosopher, unless we use the word in the profane sense to which it was degraded in France before the revolution. We find exactly the same fault with the “Nil admirari,” so often quoted as a specimen of true poetry. The original sentiment is anti-poetical. The very words lay the spirit of poetry at the outset. Who could dare to call himself a poet and begin a poem with “Nil admirari?” A man who has lost the capacity for wonder, the power of being astonished, has lost all power of enthusiasm, all power of being a poet. And hence the very versification is, as it must be, poor, and after beginning with heaven, and earth, and the sun, and the stars, and all that should belong to the sublime, falls down at once to commonplace satire.

Now for the *De Arte Poetica*. We have tried him in the religious and philosophical line, and we have tried what the inspiration of a great name could do, and we find in all these performances that Horace does not merit the epithet of a sublime, or even that of a great poet; still in an Essay on Poetry, we may perhaps find the poet at last. But first we will examine his picture of dramatic inspiration, in the Epistle to Augustus (Ep. ii. 1):—

“ Ille per extentum funem mihi posse videtur
Ire poëta, meum qui pectus inaniter angit,
Irritat, mulcet, falsis terroribus implet,
Ut magus; et modo me Thebis, modo ponit Athenis:”

“*extentum funem*,” the length of the tether; just such an expression as becomes a verse-maker. A poet has no tether, knows no restraint, and can fancy no bounds. “*Pectus inaniter angit*,” and “*falsis terroribus*,” how anti-sublime, how utterly soulless, how incapable of describing what he attempted, is the man who uses these epithets. He is attempting to describe the magic spells by which a dramatic representation can affect the spectator, and he, in two words, shows that they had no power over him; he can coolly talk of the vanity and unreality of what he wants to praise! he cannot carry away with him the hearts of his readers, for his own was not carried away by the very scenes he tells us should have that power; and yet this is a passage which critics tell us includes all that Shakespear can effect. The wonder is not that a false terror can affect us, but that the author has the power of making us really agitated. Horace is surprised that fictitious woes should affect our minds; if he had been truly moved, he would have been surprised at the truth, not at the falsehood. It is the truth to nature which is the magic art, the real sublime; but this Horace was not capable of feeling or comprehending. He enlarges upon the drama in the *Ars Poetica*, and he would have induced his countrymen to patronize the real drama, instead of their shows and fights; his persuasions were ineffectual, and we cannot wonder that they were so. He says:

“ Sit Medea ferox, invictaque; flebilis Ino,
Perfidus Ixion, Io vaga, tristis Orestes.”

This summing up of the characters of the greatest dramas of Antiquity with an epithet or two a-piece, is in itself absurd, but it is not even well done, “*tristis*,” is so totally unworthy of the frenzied remorse of Orestes; “*tristis*”—a dutiful young gentleman in black broad tunic, regretting a mother who had died very respectably of the influenza, might be called “*tristis*”—but to have nothing stronger to say of the fury-pursued Orestes is a

poverty of expression that is piteous. It is hardly possible to form the idea of a human being who could write of the Iliad and the Odyssey, a dry catalogue of names, and a set of arid rules for composition; even now, who can speak with cold criticism of Homer? but in the days of Horace, when the theology of Homer was still the religion of his country; when Jupiter and Juno were still deities, and the Homeric host of heaven were still the visible idols before his eyes, how could he write thus unimpassionedly of their poet? How can he be admired for his often-quoted "*bonus dormitat Homerus*"—so exactly the self-sufficient style of a gentleman about town—"the good Homer," a patronizing regret that he had not had the advantage of a court education. We need go no further; we have sought in vain for any thing sublime; it is not to be found.

We are told, however, that we have in Horace the plaintive sweetness of Simonides. His verses on Virgil's departure are, we believe, those which are considered as his tenderest production:—

" Sic te Diva potens Cypri,
Sic fratres Helenæ, lucida sidera,
Ventorumque regat pater,
Obstrictis aliis, præter Iapyga,
Navis, quæ tibi creditum
Debes Virgilium, finibus Atticis
Reddas incolumem, precor;
Et serves animæ dimidium meæ."

We are not ourselves guilty of the comparison, we have only quoted the opinion of a critic, and for answer to his criticism, we give the following from Simonides:—

* * * * *

Νέωτα δ' οὐδείς δοκεῖ βροτῶν,
πλούτῳ τε καὶ γαθοῖσιν ἵξεσθαι φίλος.
φθάνει δὲ τὸν μὲν γῆρας ἄζηλον λαβὼν
πρὶν τέρμ' ἵκηται, τοὺς δὲ δύστηνοι νόσοι
φθείρουσι θνητῶν, τοὺς δ' Ἀρεῖ δεδμημένους
πέμπει μελαίνης Ἀΐδης ὑπὸ χθοῖός.
οἱ δ' ἐν θαλάσῃ λαίλαπι κλονεύμενοι
καὶ κύμασιν πολλοῖσι πορφυρῆς ἁλὸς
θνήσκουσιν, εὖτ' ἂν μὴ δυιήσωνται ζόειν.
οἱ δ' ἀγχόνην ἄψαντο δυστήνῳ μόρῳ
καὶ τὰ γρετοὶ λείπουσιν ἡλίου φῶς·
οὕτω κακῶν ἅπ' οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ μυρία
βροτοῖσι κῆρες καὶ ἐπίφραστοι δυνάει
καὶ πῆματ' ἐστίν. * * * * *

We have thus given passages from some of our author's most

admired works in support of our opinion ; but it is not thus that we judge of a writer. It is by the general impression left on the mind, the passages which remain in the memory, that our opinion is formed. The general impression on reading the works of Horace, is of wit, justly expressed satire, excellent good sense, and perfect good humour. The passages which occur for quotation are all of this class, and the imitations which have been made of him, are all of the satirist and the man of the world. Fame enough, one would think. It is only injuring his fame to speak of him as a great poet. This arises, however, in part, it must be allowed, in spite of his deprecatory address to Pindar, from his own presumption. He would needs write of high things ; he had no high thoughts. In the days of Augustus, the religious character of the Romans, which had so long distinguished and upheld their power, was beginning to wear away. The necessity for a purer faith was becoming every day more manifest, and the mighty revolution was at hand, which was for a time to make the Eternal City the capital of the Christian, as it had been of the heathen world, and where it was so long to hold a spiritual dominion, as tyrannic and supreme as that temporal empire which broke in its own weight, fell to pieces and crumbled into dust : a change which Horace and his patron not only did not foresee, but could not have comprehended. That the idols, whose temples and processions they were upholding as a state necessity, should perish, they might imagine ; but the religious rise of feeling, the aspiration of man after the unknown, and his incapacity of existence without devotion, could not have occurred to them. They were just in that degree of civilization when a few, who have no great bodily sufferings, or mental anxieties, men of cold hearts and witty heads, arrive at a conclusion that all religion is superstition, and that superstition does for the vulgar, but that "we are above it." Thus was the first great source of the sublime cut off. The next, the heroism of liberty, was dead. Horace could only celebrate the splendid despotism erected on its tomb. The glory of war, and the fierce joys of warrior life, were abhorrent to his coward nature ; and for such a nature, in such circumstances, to attempt the sublime, was absurd, and equally so to try to "do" tenderness ; it was not in the least in his line ; we doubt if it occurred to him.

His great boast of introducing the Lyric measure into the Latin tongue was also a fantastic experiment—it would have been so in a real genius, a real poet, but a true poet would never have done it. A poet who was conscious of his own powers would have at once made a style of his own. His own genius would have seized the national form ; his powers would have tamed his

language, were it never so rude; he would never have gone to borrow from a foreign tongue. The easiest and most rhythmical ballad measure in the world is that of the Spanish romances, and when the Spanish writers adopted the Italian sonnet, though still poetical, the life was gone. The Pindaric measure is out of the very nature of the Latin tongue; and though writers speak of the odes of Horace as sung, we doubt that they ever were. There does not appear to us any evidence that they were performed to music, and their nature appears most unmusical.

Mr. Macaulay, in his unrivalled modern *Lays of Rome*, says, in his introduction, that the measure of the antique lays was that of "Margery Daw." The instances he gives are undoubtedly in that cherished form, but we have few fragments to go upon. We can fancy, that, as the language of the Augustan age disappeared, melting into all the modern tongues of the fallen empire, the old rude forms forced themselves, as the granite remains, through the superincumbent mass, while the general convulsion of Italy under the Gothic invasions swept away the mass of borrowed refinement. The language as well as the empire of the Romans broke up into every variety of form, and while the words of common life in Italy resolved themselves into modern Italian, the words of what was considered Latin continued to be used by those who esteemed themselves learned. In Spain, and among the Troubadours and Trouveurs, a national ballad measure formed itself from the necessity of expressing their passions of war and love; while devotion found as necessary and natural a form of expression in the old measure of antique Rome. We have seen in Mr. Macaulay's *Lays*, how superior are those which express themselves in our national ballad, Chevy Chase, Percy-Reliques measure.

But how should the construction of verses originally formed for old war songs have suited hymns and sacred chaunts? The construction was only the necessity, the destiny of the language that was used. The Italian or the language of the profane mimic singers was felt to be unsuited to the purposes of piety: Latin was necessarily adopted: and its most vocal form as necessarily assumed.—The sublime invention of the music that was to accompany it, was by force of those sublime feelings of devotion which belonged to those ages when faith still possessed some of the impulse of its origin. The horrors of Pagan civilization had given way before it. We use the word civilization because there is no other which describes the degree of refinement to which Rome and her states had arrived in the age of Augustus, when the light of Christianity first dawned upon the world. That such a light should have been followed by such a darkness as that of

the earlier centuries of our era, is not wonderful. The so-called civilization of heathenism was that of successful conquest, introduction of foreign business, and accumulation of wealth, such plenty of eatables and drinkables and wearables that man could afford to be nice and choice and luxurious in their use—the quiet of a despotic government, the ease and idleness, which, if it did not give them leisure to be good, gave them vacant hours which must be amused. The “old and plain songs of the old time” would not do—Greek had been studied, Greek was fashionable, and Greek stories and Greek plays were as much the thing as to have French novels on our tables, or to attend the French theatre is now in England. And to please these fastidious *fainéants* the writers of the drama were obliged, as Horace says, to take the old-established Grecian subjects. And they were wiser in their generation than he was. Roman drama on Roman story never seems to have succeeded, at least we have no trace remaining of it. And Horace had recourse to the middle course of adopting a Greek form for Roman words, which, like other middle courses, the resource of mediocrity, proved, as we have found, a signal failure, at least as a great work of art. In all works of first-rate genius there is an end to be worked out, a purpose to be completed. The intention of the ode is sublimity: it was not attained by Horace, but it fully answered the secondary purpose which always belongs to a second-rate genius. He had his contemporary applause. His verses pleased his society. They were exactly such as would succeed in such a society, and our interest in all that belongs to such a singular period, the delight we take in tracing out the allusions to known events, the fascination of following out a Scholiast hint, and all those “joys that only scholars know,” have misled our scholars into the undue admiration of Horace, which we have endeavoured to combat. And such writing, the result of such society, was only revived to man’s admiration, after that night of what must be called barbarism, because we have no other word to express the antithesis of what we call civilization. We want a word for each side of this antithesis; we want a word which should express the complicated idea of a state of society where all creature and all mental comforts and refinements abound at the same time that morality and religion are forgotten, or exist only in words. Such was the Augustan age—such was France before the Revolution—such is France after the Revolution, with this difference, that before the Revolution religion and morality did still exist in words, and since the Revolution they exist not even in idea, if we may judge from the style of novels which the youth of France take pleasure in writing, and the youth of England take pleasure in reading—we

want, on the other hand, a word which should express the complicated notion of a state of society in which, without wealth, without leisure for the business of bodily or of mental refinement, there exist many of the nobler sentiments of piety and heroism incompatible with times when the division of labour has divided so unfairly the labour and the enjoyment of life.

It was in this period, which for want of another name we call barbarous, that in the horror of Pagan superstition and Pagan wickedness, heathen writings, because of their subjects, became abhorrent to Christian feeling: high-wrought feelings of devotion, the fervour of a new faith, the exaltation of a religion that spoke to the heart rather than to the eye, must express itself in music and poetry; it found a music and a poetry of its own; and was satisfied. In the zeal for theology nothing but theology was worthy of study, and the very devotional turn of the Middle Ages, and the "tomes of casuistry," on which they were fain to batten, were the causes why, when we recurred to the forgotten glories of paganism, and disinterred the long-buried relics of heathen poetry, we fell to worshipping them. So long used to the hard and meagre diet of this dry casuistry and theology, it was not surprising that we should gorge upon the rich banquet of classic literature when spread before us—gorge to repletion. Once begun it went on regularly, handed down from teacher to teacher, and while all the great and real poets and writers were duly prized and praised and taught by great masters, the inferior sort, more level to the capacity of inferior teachers, were taken up as eagerly and taught as zealously, and continue to be so taught to this day.

Horace more especially came to the schoolmaster's hands, as if expressly made for a school book; there is nothing that requires exalted feelings to be able to enjoy, nothing in the style very difficult of apprehension. There are none of the anomalies of manners which startle in Homer; while his *Art of Poetry* was so easy a summary of former writings; there is always something captivating in lists of works and names which are known; something so agreeable, especially to a teacher in the ready cut and dry criticism, and something so satisfactory in the didactic form. To be told what we ought to think is such a relief to the mind, and for a schoolmaster such a comfort. To study and to teach Horace's *Art of Poetry* seemed to be all that the heart of tutor could desire, a learning made easy, or rather teaching made easy to the teacher, which should have warned off every real scholar from the work. It was evidently the production of a very superficial state of society, agreeable only to superficial scholars, and likely only to produce superficial students. Not that we would be understood to reject or despise the *De Arte Poetica*, such as it is; for what it is,

we could ill have spared it from among the classics. It is, if justly appreciated, as admirable as it is curious; its notices of what was then and is now thought excellent, and its canons of criticism are, when taken as what they are, perfect; and it is their true value that we would insist upon, not only in justice to our author—for what greater injustice is there than over praise—but in justice to ourselves, in our zeal for the true education of our youth—the zeal for teaching them only true excellence. If taught to overvalue second-rate merit, we become second-rate in all our tastes and all our views, and the effect appears in all our actions. And, as society becomes more complicated and more refined, where education is most diffused, first-rate merit, first-rate minds are more rare. To be a great man where all the rest are uneducated and unrefined—unable alike to oppose or to rival—is easy. But where a great mass of mankind are to a certain degree well taught, and all able to judge and to rival; to be superior, is to be superior indeed. All men, however well educated, however refined, must be governed and will be led—that the governors and leaders should lead to what is highest, is the great desideratum. No education can give natural powers; but to direct them and exalt them is the business of the teacher; and, that he should so teach, he must be so minded. And though an undue admiration of a second-rate author like Horace appears a very venial sin, it is one which tends to lower the tone and enfeeble the powers of the mind, and as such it is in teachers and learners a real and very serious crime.

- ART. VII.—1. *Diocesan Synods and Convocation. A Charge delivered to the Clergy and Churchwardens of the Archdeaconry of Chichester. By the Rev. J. GARBETT, Archdeacon of Chichester.* London: Hatchard.
2. *The Appeal to Convocation. A Charge to the Clergy of the East Riding. By ROBERT J. WILBERFORCE, M.A., Archdeacon of the East Riding.* London: Murray.
3. *Convocation. A Letter to the Right Hon. S. H. Walpole, Secretary of State, &c. By E. HAROLD BROWNE, M.A., Prebendary of Exeter, Vicar of Kenwyn.* London: J. W. Parker.
4. *Some Objections to the Revival of Ecclesiastical Synods Answered. A Sermon by the Rev. J. D. WHEELER, M.A., &c.* Oxford: J. H. Parker.
5. *The Ancient Practice and Proposed Revival of Diocesan Synods in England. By WILLIAM POUND, M.A.* London: Hatchard; Parker, 337, Strand.

THE question of the revival of synodal action in the Church of England has for some years made so much progress, and has recently received so great an impulse from various causes, which it is here needless to specify, that we presume the time is not remote when some attempt will be made to reinstate the Convocation or to establish a Synod. It would be impossible, in our view, to overrate the importance of that event, when it shall really occur; and we do think that no true and faithful son of the Church of England can refrain from contemplating the bare possibility with feelings in which anxiety is mingled with hope, and which must lead him to pray that those in whose hands the decision of the important practical questions connected with this subject is placed, may be enlightened with wisdom from on high, to enable them to act with the foresight and deliberation, which will be required to meet the difficulties and risks in their way.

Those objections to the revival of synodal action which appear to be most really deserving of attention from Churchmen, are of a practical nature; and, beyond doubt they are, at first sight, most serious. We cannot in the least wonder to find some of the warmest and most sincere friends of the Church of England either wholly or partially influenced by those objections. Un-

doubtedly if, as they suppose, the revival of synodal action were to afford a new and a wider field for the struggles of religious party—if it were to revive the contests between the Bishops and the inferior Clergy which convocation during the earlier portion of last century exhibited, then we should at once agree with them that it were wiser to leave matters as they are at present. We readily admit that if contested elections, resembling essentially those for secular offices, were to array our clergy and laity in hostile bands, the evils from which we suffer might be increased. We admit that if a synod, elected amidst the struggle of party, and representing different classes of opinions, were to set to work sooner or later on all the points in controversy, and to attempt to solve all the speculative questions which are now in discussion, the result would be, in a high degree, perilous to the Church. But it appears to be too much to assume, that if these and other possible evils are steadfastly examined with a view to prevent their occurrence, *no remedy can possibly be devised*. It seems unreasonable to argue, that because such and such results are likely to follow under certain circumstances actual or possible, they must equally follow, no matter what modifications or regulations may be made.

It appears to us that there are three points of primary importance to be attended to in any attempt to reconstruct a synod for the Church of England. The first is to provide a deliberative body, which is well qualified by its constitution to consult for the interests of the Church of England in its widest acceptation, as consisting of all who are attached to its communion. The second is to lay down general rules for the deliberations and proceedings of the body thus created, so as to ensure order, propriety, and the dispatch of its business. The third is to determine how far, and under what limitations the deliberations of the body so created are to extend.

It seems to us that these are preliminaries which ought to be settled by some authority before any attempt is made to proceed to other points; and were they satisfactorily settled, we apprehend that most of the objections which are now made by good men to the notion of synodal action would disappear.

I. With reference to the constitution of a synod for the Church of England, it may be observed in the first place, that a synod to be really national should include the bishops of the Established Church in England and Ireland—together with other assistant members, whether of the clergy or the laity, taken from all parts of the United Kingdom. We would give seats to all colonial bishops who might be in England. Ireland should be represented in proportion to the number of its bishops, by deans, archdeacons, and

deputies of parochial clergy. Such would be our notion of the numbers of the synod: forty bishops of Great Britain and Ireland, colonial bishops, about forty deans, seventy archdeacons, thirty proctors of English chapters, and seventy or eighty proctors of the English and Irish parochial clergy—together about 250 or 260; besides some of the laity. Having thus stated our general notion of the numbers of the synod, we would remark that, in looking to ancient precedents and the general practice of the Church in the early ages, a question occurs whether a synod should not consist of the bishops only. It is apparent that in most of the general and other large councils held in those ages, the right of voting and subscription was restricted to bishops and their deputies. In the Church of Rome at present it is held, that both in general and provincial synods none but bishops have an inherent right of sitting as judges, and giving their votes. Others may be present by custom or favour, but bishops alone are the proper judges in Roman Catholic synods.

We apprehend, however, that the members of the Church of England generally, including our venerated hierarchy, are not of opinion that it would be advisable in the present day to compose a synod of our Church simply of bishops, to the exclusion of the inferior clergy and other members of the Church. Independently of other considerations, it would be evidently desirable that the bishops should be enabled to call to their councils those of the clergy or laity whose knowledge, or experience, or habits of business, might be of essential service. Omitting for the present the question, how far it is desirable to introduce the laity into synods of the Church of England—a point on which we shall hereafter speak—we think it may fairly be assumed that no synod ought to consist exclusively of bishops.

But then a question of great importance here arises—and on the determination of which much of the practical working of a synod must be dependent. It is this: in what relation should bishops assembled in synod stand to presbyters and laymen, if any such were to be admitted to share in synodal deliberations?

Now we conceive that in an episcopal Church there can be but one answer to this question. The bishops in any synod must have superior authority: the authority of others must be *subordinate* to theirs. The bishops are the chief governors of the Church, invested with ordinary jurisdiction, spiritual rulers of the clergy as well as of the laity. This principle is not only reasonable in itself, and accordant with the practice of the Church at all times, but it has always been recognized in Convocation, in which the lower house proceeds by way of *petition* to the upper house.

It appears, then, on these principles, that in any synod which might be established, the authority of the episcopate ought to be fully recognized, and removed from any risk of being infringed on by any other inferior members of the synod. This subject should be very carefully considered, because, when convocation was in action during the last century, there were contests on this very point, which indicated that the relative position of the bishops and of the inferior clergy was not determined. The risk, undoubtedly, in establishing a lower house of convocation is, that it may suppose itself in a position parallel to that of the House of Commons in the present day, and that following this temporal precedent, it may be led to separate action independent of the episcopate, or may attempt to coerce the upper house by a system of agitation.

The permanent division of the convocation of the province of Canterbury into two houses has apparently a tendency to foster such notions. This division was not an original feature in the convocation: in the province of York it has not been introduced, but the bishops and clergy have always deliberated in one house. It certainly seems that the different practice in the province of Canterbury is not without risk of engendering disputes between the bishops and clergy in the present day: it constitutes the latter into a separate body, with its speaker, and its privileges, real or imaginary. It removes from that body the presence of its superiors, and gives to individuals of the inferior clergy the personal influence and authority which would more naturally belong to the episcopate. Now we conceive that these are obvious tendencies of the system of *permanently* dividing a synod into two houses; and they are, we think, deserving of serious consideration. It may be advisable, on certain occasions, that the different orders of a synod should deliberate separately—it is evidently necessary that the episcopate should have the power of doing so—but their permanent and ordinary separation must have, we think, a tendency to create dissension, or to overbear the legitimate authority of the episcopate. This system might have worked well enough in different times from the present; but, considering the general spirit of the age, which has manifested itself in no inconsiderable degree in the Church, we should think that in any synodical arrangements, including the inferior clergy, it would be eminently desirable to place them more immediately under the direction and supervision of the episcopate than they are by the present arrangements.

Supposing, therefore, clergy and laity to be introduced into a synod, we should say that the greatest care should be taken to make them practically subordinate to the episcopate. Mere

theoretical subordination would not meet practical risks : the inferior clergy and laity ought to be placed in so defined a position, that it would be next to impossible that any contest or struggle for power should arise. We conceive that this might be accomplished without much difficulty, if the leading principle were steadily carried out,—that the inferior clergy and laity do not come to a synod to act as judges and legislators, with equal or co-ordinate authority with the bishops ; but that they come there as the assistants and advisers of the bishops, in subordination to their authority.

If this principle be well founded, it would follow that the clergy and laity in a synod are not to initiate measures themselves, but to wait until they are consulted by their superiors, or specially invited to offer suggestions. Nor should they have the power of propounding their opinions in a synod at all times, without check or control, or even without permission. Nor does it seem consistent with the due authority of the episcopate, that the clergy or laity should meet separately, and deliberate under presidents chosen by themselves ; to the exclusion of the episcopal authority.

It appears to us, therefore, that the constitution of the synod, and its proceedings, must depend materially on the view which is taken of the episcopal order. If the clergy and laity are to be regarded as independent judges in questions of doctrine and discipline, with an authority co-ordinate to that of the bishops, one course may be taken ; but if they are to be in subordination to the bishops, another course will be taken. In the latter case, it would not seem necessary that they should be elected by any bodies of constituents. It may be desirable and expedient that the clergy or laity should choose persons in whom they have confidence, and that the bishops in synod should avail themselves of the advice specially of those clergy and laity, because it may inspire greater confidence in the synod, and may facilitate the reception of its regulations. But the clergy and laity in synod, being only the selected advisers of the bishops, and subordinate to them, they are not placed in a different and more authoritative position, in relation to the bishops, by being elected.

We say this, because we see nothing in Christian antiquity of this practice of *electing deputies* from the clergy and laity to attend synods. It is very true that the bishops who went to synods brought some of their clergy with them, but we are not aware of any cases in which those clergy were elected, except by the bishop himself. And in the mixed synods of the Carlovin-gian period, the laity who were present were the magnates of the state, summoned by the sovereign. The practice of electing deputies from the clergy to synods arose about the thirteenth cen-

tury, from which date it has been customary in England ; and having existed so long, it would be inexpedient, without any strict necessity, to interfere with it. All that seems requisite is, that the representation of the parochial clergy should be somewhat more full than it now is ; and we conceive, that were every Arch-deaconry to return one representative, the number would be quite sufficient, and the inconveniences which arise under the present arrangements, when there are several archdeaconries in a diocese, would be obviated.

No sufficient reason, we think, has been alleged, for depriving the chapters of the right of returning representatives, which they have enjoyed quite as long as the parochial clergy. Nor does it seem requisite in any way to interfere with the official seats held by the deans and archdeacons, whose influence would probably be generally of a conservative character.

We must own that, were it not for the inexpediency of disturbing ancient privileges, we should not regret to see the parochial clergy relieved from the necessity of electing deputies to a synod, considering the contentions to which elections might give rise, and the possibility of their being influenced by the secret organization of some religious party ; but we think the evil of changing the system would be greater than that of permitting its continuance. At the same time, if these elections be retained, means should be devised for enabling the clergy to vote, without being obliged to leave their parishes for the purpose ; and this might easily be done by the permission of written votes, or votes by proxy. We admit that there might occasionally be some contested elections ; and that some temporary inconveniences might thence result ; but we are persuaded that, if the clergy generally were to retain their present right of suffrage, they would, on the whole, return a valuable and respectable body of men ; and the recent election of proctors will, we believe, fully bear out the justice of this anticipation.

But a question here arises, which is one of the gravest importance and difficulty : we allude to the admission of the laity into a synod. It is not that we see any objection to this admission in theory ; for we believe that it is consistent with the theory and practice of the Church universal. Nor is it that we feel any repugnance to the admission of the laity in itself, because we are perfectly certain that no higher benefit could be conferred on the Church, if it could be guarded against serious evils. We conceive, indeed, that the question is of so much importance, that if no means can be found for solving it, the revival of synodal action is undesirable ; for a synod *exclusively* clerical would, we think, be, in many respects, a dangerous experiment. But, un-

doubtedly, there are difficulties—practical difficulties—in the way. Of these we shall speak, with a view to suggest means for obviating them, after we have referred in some degree to the opinions of those amongst the clergy who have recently objected to the admission of the laity into a synod; following, in this respect, the views of Mr. Keble, and of the “Theologian.”

The objections which have been raised to the admission of the laity to a synod are grounded on the principle that no layman was ever admitted to sit and vote in any council of the early Church before the division of the East and West—that even presbyters only did so by special allowance of the bishops; and that bishops are the only judges in faith and morals. Now this argument, if pressed to its legitimate consequences, might be made use of to urge the exclusion of presbyters from our synods. If, however, this is not contended for, it seems that the argument rather tells in favour of the admission of the laity; for if presbyters have no right of themselves to sit and vote in councils, but may notwithstanding be admitted to do so by consent of bishops, then why, we would ask, may not laity be admitted by the same authority? And then comes the question whether, as a matter of fact, the brethren were excluded from the earlier synods of the Church. Here Mr. Browne should be heard.

“But first, it is necessary to ask, Is there Scriptural and primitive authority for laymen to sit in synods of the Church? (1.) The Scripture authority seems to me to be clearly for it. The Synodical Epistle of the Council of Jerusalem (Acts xv. 23) begins, ‘The Apostles and elders and brethren.’ I am not ignorant that four most important MSS. omit the last ‘and;’ still Griesbach does not reject it, but marks it as (though doubtful) yet probably to be retained. But there is no such uncertainty in the verse preceding, where we read, ‘Then pleased it the Apostles and elders with the *whole Church*;

which shows, as plainly as words can show, that the decree of the Apostles and elders was approved by the laity of the Church. And from the language of ver. 12 (‘Then all the multitude kept silence, and gave audience’), we can scarcely fail to infer that the laity not only consented after the synod, but, having been present during its session, were appealed to by those who addressed and guided it.

“(2.) To pass from Scriptural to ecclesiastical usage, it is argued by some, that bishops alone attended general councils, and that to them therefore, and to them only, is committed the right of deliberating and of making laws. But there may be many reasons why general synods were mostly synods of bishops. They were gathered from great distances; each diocese would send but one representative; and that one representative would be, of course, the bishop. Again, no general council met before the fourth century. Now the ablest defender of Episcopacy, that this Church of England ever produced, has left us

his opinion, that in the fourth century the powers and dignity of the presbyters had diminished throughout the world, the episcopal power having encroached upon it. This will give another reason, why by that time it might have become the custom, that bishops only should vote in councils. Yet it is not true, that none but bishops attended. At the second general council at Constantinople, A.D. 381, three presbyters subscribed, and many other instances have been produced of similar subscriptions in similar cases. But what we have to do with are not general, but provincial synods. And there we have full proof that sometimes not only bishops, presbyters, and deacons, but also laymen were present, consented and subscribed. One or two examples will be evidence enough. St. Cyprian, wont to assemble provincial synods, and to preside at them as metropolitan, expressed his determination never to do any thing on his own private authority, without the counsel of the clergy and the consent of the people. And so the council of Carthage, called by him A.D. 256, was attended by bishops from Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, with their presbyters and deacons, a great portion also of the people being present. The council of Illiberis, A.D. 300, was attended by thirty presbyters, by deacons and laity. And at the second council of Orange, A.D. 529, we find fourteen bishops and eight eminent laymen subscribing the decrees. These are surely proofs enough that neither on scriptural nor ecclesiastical principles are we obliged to exclude the laity from debating with us for the good of the Church."—pp. 23—25.

We must refer the reader to Mr. Browne's pages for the authorities on which these statements are made. We would only mention the fact stated by him in reference to the Synod of Orange, A.D. 529, that the form of subscription by the bishops is—*episcopus consensi et subscripsi*, or *relegi et subscripsi*; and that of the laity is—*consentiens subscripsi*. But the truth is that from the period of the Synod of Orange the ordinary practice in the Western Church was to include the laity in ecclesiastical synods. It was customary for five or six centuries: the custom of mixed synods prevailed in England, in France, Germany, Spain. The capitulars of Charlemagne, and the succeeding emperors of the West, were drawn up in mixed synods of clergy and barons: the Anglo-Saxon synods were composed in the same way. It is quite true that the laymen who were present in these synods were, in most cases, the magnates of the land; but they were laymen notwithstanding; and therefore we conceive it is impossible to maintain, in the face of the undeniable practice of the Church for so many centuries, that it is unlawful for the laity to be present in synods, or to take any part in them.

Another objection to the admission of laity into synods is founded on the results which are alleged to have followed from their presence in the conventions of the American Church. The

omission of the Athanasian Creed, in the American Prayer Book, is ascribed to them, and it is assumed that they must necessarily endeavour to lower the tone of doctrine in the English Church, or attempt dangerous innovations. It is alleged that they are not well instructed or informed in matters of doctrine or discipline, and not so competent to judge of these matters as the clergy. Now this line of argument may prove that the laity do not occupy their right place in the American conventions, or it may prove that the laity should not be indiscriminately or carelessly admitted into a synod. But to go beyond this, and affirm that laymen cannot be found whose virtues, knowledge, and love of the Church are of the highest description—to affirm that all English laymen are necessarily ecclesiastical revolutionists, or that they must necessarily desire dangerous alterations in the liturgy, is so evidently absurd, that we cannot believe that any one entertains such an idea. The real objection felt then must be this—that if laity are to be in a synod, they must necessarily come there as representatives of the spirit of irreverence, ignorance, party spirit, and worldliness, which is so characteristic of the present age, and which too often manifests itself in public meetings. We own that we cannot feel surprise at the alarm felt on this point, when we reflect on the spirit in which ecclesiastical topics are sometimes discussed even in parliament; and very possibly, those from whom the objection has principally arisen, may be apprehensive lest the views to which they themselves are most favourable might be altogether repudiated by representatives of the laity of England.

But omitting any consideration of these private and unavowed apprehensions, it appears to us that the practical objection to the lay element in synods is grounded on the notion that it must necessarily be based on a popular election. It is assumed that the lay members of the Church must *elect*, or the communicants must *elect*, just as the clergy elect their proctors. But we here beg leave to enter a strong protest against its being assumed that popular election is any necessary condition to the presence of laity in the synods of the English Church. It is true that the American Church furnishes a precedent for the election of laymen to sit in convention; but that precedent is a very modern one, and it stands alone. On the other hand, from the sixth to the fourteenth century, we find a long series of precedents in all Christian countries, which may be seen in the work of Thomas-sinus, “*De Beneficiis*”—precedents of synods in which the laity were present; but with no trace of popular elections—always by summons of the sovereign. It may be argued that elections by the people would be in some degree essential to give to the

laity confidence in the proceedings of convocation—that unless its lay members were the actual chosen representatives of the people, their presence would be of no value. It appears that this would be a mistaken notion. A lay element in convocation would be valuable in itself—valuable, as enabling the clergy to appreciate readily the lay feeling—valuable, as giving a fuller representation of the general views of Churchmen—valuable, it might be, in furnishing men of practical good sense, and habits of business, and secular knowledge. But it appears that all that is required by any party, is, that there should be some body of laymen in convocation. The mode of their appointment is a question so entirely open, that we have never yet met any expression of a desire that it should take place in any particular way. We should say, that as far as the feeling of the laity in general is concerned, they have no wish for popular elections of laity for convocation, and that if the Crown were to nominate the lay members of convocation, the nation at large would be quite as well satisfied as if the laity were to elect their own representatives. And be it remembered that there are questions of much practical difficulty in electing deputies of the laity. Universal suffrage would be impossible—communicant suffrage might be opposed as exclusive. And then, how are the people, or the communicants, or even the churchwardens (supposing the suffrage limited to them), in a diocese extending over 500 parishes, to know what candidates are really qualified to represent them? Would not a great amount of trouble and inconvenience be incurred in various directions merely for the sake of an election, which, after all, must to a great extent be a matter of chance, or which might possibly lead to strife and disputes? It is generally admitted, indeed, that the difficulties in the way of electing deputies for the laity are great and serious. In America each congregation returns its deputies to the Diocesan Convention, and the Diocesan Convention elects representatives for the General Convention or National Synod; but there is no such machinery of Diocesan Conventions in operation in England, and, therefore, if the laity are to be elected, it must be without the facilities which the American organization presents.

Should any plan be carried into effect by which the laity may be enabled to elect fitting representatives to be present in convocation, we should rejoice; but as the difficulty of devising any satisfactory plan is generally felt, we would suggest for consideration, whether, after all, it would not be more prudent on various accounts to endeavour to follow the precedents of mixed synods presented to us by the records of Church history, and to dispense with popular elections.

What is required is the presence of laymen—and of laymen whose character, virtue, education, and position are unexceptionable. Might not such laymen be nominated, either by the convocation, or by the bishops, or by the Crown, or by one or more of these authorities in conjunction? We are aware that any plan proposed may be liable to objections and difficulties; still, as the election and position of laymen is a leading point of difficulty in the constitution of a synod, we shall perhaps be excused for endeavouring to suggest an unexceptionable mode in which a body of laity might be appointed, who would probably possess all the requisite qualifications.

We think it must be admitted that the bishop of a diocese is a good judge of the character and position of the leading laymen in his diocese. We know not to what quarter we could look for a sounder judgment on this point. The bishop is naturally brought in contact with all those lay members of his diocese who are warmly attached to the Church, and who interest themselves in its charities, its societies, and other objects. He could be at no loss if he were called on to prepare a list of such persons whose general conduct, station, and attainments, would qualify them to take a part in the deliberations of convocation. We should, therefore, call on the bishop of each diocese to provide a list of persons qualified for this office. But we would go further, and, in order that the nomination might not be said to be a merely clerical nomination, we would have this list submitted to the Sovereign for the purpose of selecting a certain number from it who should be entitled to be present in convocation.

Now, this, we think, would be a perfectly simple and feasible plan in itself; and it would possess the advantage of obviating all questions of communicants and non-communicants—all risks of disputed elections—all danger of violent, incompetent, or unchristian men being returned as lay members. It would be consistent with the practice of the ancient mixed synods in which the lay portion consisted of the magnates of the realm summoned by the Sovereign. It would be in harmony with the rights of the Crown exhibited in the nomination to bishoprics, in which the rights of election originally possessed by the people, have been permitted to devolve on the Sovereign. We cannot but think that a body of laymen thus appointed would be, on the whole, such a body as would worthily represent the more serious-minded portion of the laity of England; and that they would work in harmony and good feeling with the clergy. Were it deemed advisable, for certain conceivable reasons, to avoid the appearance of restricting the Crown to the lists presented by the bishops, we do not think that, *practically*, any evils would result; because the Crown would

not, without some evident reason, pass over persons recommended in the ordinary and regular way.

Very possibly this suggestion may be deemed in some points liable to objections which we are not at present aware of. If so, it will of course be rejected or modified. All we would urge is this,—that the advocates of the introduction of the laity ought not to consider themselves tied to the principle of popular election.

We must frankly confess, that unless great care were taken in the election of laymen, we should look with apprehension on the introduction of any such element; and the mere circumstance of either electors or elected being communicants in the Church does not appear to furnish any sufficient security that the best men would be returned. And if popular elections be once introduced, it may not be possible to interfere with them, even if they should give rise to serious evils.

The men whom we should wish to be nominated as lay members are men who are firmly attached to their Church,—men of religious habits, of respectable attainments, and of respectable or distinguished station. The object should be, we conceive, to have a fair representation of the laity; and therefore there would be no necessity to look out for men who have made theology their chief study, or who are in knowledge or intellectual powers raised far above the usual level of educated Englishmen. We can even imagine some evils from the presence of a large body of such men in convocation: in America it appears that lawyers are, to a great extent, the leaders in the conventions; and in the peculiar circumstances of the Church there, such a state of things may be not undesirable. On the whole, however, we should rather see laymen in an English convocation taken from the nobility, gentry, and other educated laymen of average abilities and attainments, and sound sense, than professional men, whose practised abilities in forensic disputation might not be conducive to harmony.

We would now turn to another part of the subject. It is asked, in some quarters, “How far would you extend the powers of the laity in convocation? Should they be invited to sit as judges on all questions of faith and discipline?” We would reply, that, according to the principles of the Church generally, according to the constitution of the Church of England, and according to the precedents of ancient times, the bishops in synod have the chief authority; they alone have decisive votes; they sit as judges. The other members of the synod are of inferior authority; they are assistants of the bishops; they are taken into council by the bishops; the bishops desire their

counsel, and advice, and consent in various important matters. Having laid down these principles, we would say, that the extent to which questions of any sort should be submitted to the inferior clergy or laity in convocation ought to *rest with the bishops*. We would make them the sole judges of what questions should be placed before the clergy and laity: every thing ought to emanate from them; no question ought to be raised in convocation, unless it had been previously submitted to them, or to the Crown, and allowed to be brought forward.

It may seem that this is, after all, only to throw on the bishops the solution of the question. We admit that it is so; but we really think it difficult to lay down practically any rule by which questions should be divided into those that concern the laity, and those that do not concern them. We know that questions might occur which might concern the bishops and clergy only. But, to take the most important of all questions—those which concern the faith—Are not laity interested in these questions, as well as the clergy? Have they not duties in regard to the faith? Are they not responsible for their faith? If so, we cannot see on what principles they could be excluded from hearing debates on questions of faith, or from taking a part in them, or from uniting in judgments made by the bishops on such points. Of course they cannot speak with the authority of the bishops on such matters, *neither can the inferior clergy*; and yet their testimony would be of value; and we cannot think that it would be in any way inconsistent with sound principles to receive it, should it be given. If the canons of ancient councils, if the capitulars of Charlemagne and the emperors were agreed to by laity as well as clergy, we do not see why the laity should not be permitted, along with the inferior clergy, to take a part in the proceedings of our synods at the discretion of the bishops.

We believe that if the laity were chosen in the manner we have suggested, they would not be violent party men, and would take a becoming part in doctrinal discussions. And we would further add, that if the episcopate were to hold the power of originating measures, there would be a security against the rash introduction of unnecessary questions of doctrine.

II. We have spoken thus generally of the constitution of a synod, and in some degree of its mode of proceeding. We repeat that, in our opinion, all questions should be laid before the bishops and the Crown, in the first instance, and their consent obtained to the introduction of those questions. We conceive, that in addition to this, the mode of proceeding frequently adopted in the councils of the West, in parliament, and in the American Church, might be followed with advantage. Every

measure of importance, on being introduced, might be submitted to a select committee or congregation to discuss it fully in private, and to make a report, and suggest improvements, if necessary, before it were actually brought under general discussion. At the opening of a synod, it would be probably advisable to appoint committees for the purpose of examining measures, or of instituting inquiries on specific points. These committees should comprise bishops, clergy, and laity. Measures, introduced to convocation, should perhaps go through several stages, in order to give time for full discussion, and consideration before coming to any vote; and the bishops, clergy, and laity ought to vote separately, and no measure should pass without the concurrence of the three orders; if the bishops deemed it necessary. All these details, as to the mode of proceeding, would of course have to be settled before a synod should be assembled; but we conceive that there would be no difficulty in a body of practical and intelligent men taking the rules of the American Church, and those of the House of Commons, and of convocation, and of the Western synods, and laying down rules for proceeding, which would at once place a synod in a condition to enter on its functions. Possibly the Crown might entrust to a commissioner, the power of giving assent to the introduction of measures.

III. The third great question affecting a synod, is to what class of questions its deliberations should extend.

We assume, of course, that there ought not to be any question as to altering the Prayer Book, or the formularies of the Church. But as to all other questions, whether of doctrine or discipline, we are of opinion, that, provided the consent of the episcopate be previously had, no evil is likely to arise. Supposing that some question should by possibility occur, which might have the effect of exciting controversy, it might be that opinions would be modified by that controversy, and tolerable unanimity attained to, or, at all events, if there were a great division of opinion, no decision could be carried out; or, if it were, the consent of the Crown would probably be withheld, and the decision would remain inoperative.

The practical questions which may be raised in connexion with this whole subject are very numerous. We have nowhere seen them stated more ably and fully than in Archdeacon Garbett's Charge. The difficulties referred to in that Charge are all real and substantial; but they are all capable of solution, if men were really to attempt to solve them.

A new convocation has now been summoned, and many of the advocates of the revival of synodal action are anxious that it should be permitted to proceed at once to business. In this wish

we entirely concur; but we would restrict the proceedings to nominating a committee of the ablest members of both houses for the purpose of deliberating, with the aid of a body of laymen nominated by the Crown, on the alterations in the constitution and proceedings of convocation, which might be recommended to the Crown. When this measure of reform had been agreed to by convocation and approved by the Crown, we trust that a national synod, or convocation might be summoned with a reasonable hope of lending additional and effective support to the cause of our revered Church. We avail ourselves here of the pages of Archdeacon Garbett; and we do so the more readily, because they not merely meet our own views to a very considerable extent, but because they proceed from a writer who has stated in the strongest way the objections to the revival of convocation.

“VII. And this brings me to another view of the subject. It is one thing to submit to evils, as unavoidable and inseparable in this entangled world from the greatest blessings; it is another to be insensible to them, or to undervalue their importance. It is one thing to decline to embark on the revolutionary sea; it is another to obstruct temperate change, and to refuse to apply an existing organ to attain a moderate but valuable reform without a corresponding danger. Were it not for vehement passions and extreme views, and the disposition to exaggerate internal differences and subjugate internal opponents, rather than combine against our common foes, the Papist and the Infidel, I believe that convocation for *certain* definite purposes might be resuscitated. Were our views limited to such practical improvements as the *great majority of all* parties might be *brought to agree* in, such an office, subordinate as compared with a directing and central Church power, but most important to her welfare, might be found for convocation.

“1. It is impossible, for instance, to deny, not indeed the competence or constitutional power of parliament to treat of spiritual matters and the doctrinal side of Church questions, but the utter unfitness of that assembly for a dignified, or even decent, handling of them. Its party passions, its composition, its habitude of secular debate, engender a painful sense of the incongruity of such discussions with the character of that assembly. Nor is it unwilling, itself, to acknowledge such radical unfitness and virtual incompetency. These questions require a distinct spiritual assembly, under whatever name, to which the consideration of them may be referred, though the ultimate authoritative decision be not wholly in its hands. How many questions, in the Frome dispute, might, with the greatest advantage, have been referred to such a body, had it a recognized existence! Here is, in fact, a large category of cases, which deeply stir feelings of Churchmen, and which, at present, are unavoidably tost into that tempestuous popular arena.

“2. Look, again, at the many painful difficulties, the perplexities, even to vigorous and practical minds, a real entanglement of conscience between conflicting obligations, in the use of the funeral service. Look at the late petition on the subject, signed in thousands by men of all parties. Of how great value would be a serious consideration, by a competent body, of any tolerable remedy, if such there be, for this great evil, or a statement of the insuperable difficulties in the way, if there be not!

“3. There is no question, among men of any party, that the actual composition of the appeal tribunal in ecclesiastical cases is liable to strong objection, and deformed by manifest incongruities with the plainest and most acknowledged principles. The removal or adjustment of them by the State in communication with a recognized authority in the Church itself, would sweep away a formidable stumbling-block to the consciences of many holy men.

“4. The canons are now a mass of practical absurdities. And, though there is no ground for the charges of intolerance and persecution, sometimes built on their obsolete provisions, against the Church, and though with a knowledge of the statute law there is no practical difficulty in ascertaining how much is binding upon ourselves, yet their adjustment would be a great relief. To get rid of the contradictions and obsolete requirements which encumber them, would remove an unquestionable scandal.

“5. There are many rubrical and ceremonial points, of utter indifference in themselves, but which cause perplexity and disastrous differences between pastor and flock; where the strongest practical considerations necessitate a deviation from the rubrical law, and yet where the ordinary has no regulating or dispensing power. It would be a great gain to the Church, and emancipate some minds from many troublesome scruples, if the ordinary had such a discretion legally vested in his hands, and sufficient authority *to enforce* such alternative direction.

“6. It is impossible that the State should ever abandon its rights and its prerogatives, to enforce and regulate the proper application of ecclesiastical property, and its better distribution, where possible, to attain its great religious and political ends. Great changes in this and other important points have, moreover, by prescription, submission, and tacit consent, received at least a virtual ratification and the consent of the Church. But it is fervently to be desired, were it possible, that the Church should stamp with a formal and legal ratification arrangements so important. It would hardly be withheld, if her interests were really consulted; and she would no longer seem to consent in chains. In these points no party question is involved, and no party passions could well be raised. It would be a matter of great rejoicing, and relief to us all from an accumulating load of difficulty and perplexity, if such questions could be safely referred to convocation or some such body.

“There are other points which I might mention, such as adjusting the

Liturgy to the wants of our Colonial Church, the multiplication of our episcopate at home, the division of the services, and the like ; but I have enumerated sufficient.

“ If no other advantage came of it, and we remained practically as we are, yet the existence of such a central body, to deliberate on, if not to remedy confessed evils and anomalies, would satisfy reasonable constitutional requirements, and free many men’s minds from painful perplexities. *Were all parties agreed*, and could they trust each other’s views, a commission being issued by the Crown, and the constitution of convocation *modified* with the consent of parliament, it would be sufficient for *this limited* purpose, and might easily receive instructions from the primary assemblies of the Church. But it *must be certain*, as a preliminary condition, that no question shall be raised, affecting the fundamental relations of the Church to the State, or even the acknowledged position of our traditional parties among ourselves. With such agreement, the deliberations of a Church Assembly thus restricted would be as healthy for the Church, with all the infirmities of human passion, as it is for the State. But in the House of Commons, such freedom of debate invigorates the political life, because the vast majority of the assembly are agreed on the bases of the constitution. First principles are not at stake. But with us, as our condition now is, with the Romanist leaven profoundly fermenting in men’s minds and hearts, the very first principles of doctrine, the rule of faith, the union between Church and State, are vehemently questioned, and set all passions on fire. The differences between large sections among us are fundamental. Points the most indifferent are coloured like prime verities, by being bound up, in violent cohesion, such as in times like these the fanaticism of party enforces, with doctrines on which men are prepared to combat to the death. But for such agreement as might enable convocation to work under the control of the Crown for such purposes as these, I, for one, am ready to do the utmost.”—pp. 75—79.

We must now bring our remarks to a close, with a sincere hope that the efforts which are being made for the restoration of the synods of the Church of England may be ere long successful. We believe that the restoration of synods has become a matter of necessity ; but all who love the Church of England must feel that the restoration in order to be beneficial to the Church must be carefully, temperately, and judiciously undertaken. Whether synodical action is or is not suitable to the Church of England in the nineteenth century, can only be decided by making an experiment. Let that experiment be tried under favourable circumstances, and not with our present imperfect organization, and ill-defined system of convocation : let the efforts of Churchmen be directed to bring about an improved organization ; we shall then see whether the Church cannot act with moderation, and in a Christian spirit ; whether she cannot set herself to the work of

promoting the influence of practical Christianity, and of diminishing the dominion of vice and immorality ; whether she cannot cease for a time from disputes and jealousies, and bickerings of party, and gird herself to convert the heathen amidst our own land—the myriads of baptized infidels, and of those whose Sabbath is spent in the pursuit of gross indulgences, of intemperance, or of frivolity.

The moral and religious improvement of the people of England is the task before the Church. Mere speculative differences, or mere questions as to externals, have assumed an undue importance amongst us. Would that men could look into the deeper and more momentous problem before them—how to make religion more influential over the masses ! The higher classes amongst us may be religious : the lower are too generally sunk in carnal vices, and in deadness to the concerns of their souls. Give us a synod which shall engage itself in practical measures, for the purpose of extending the influences of religion and morality ; and we believe that the benefit of such a synod will be felt and recognized ere long, not only by the Church of England, but by the nation at large.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

-
1. The Penny Post.—The Churchman's Monthly Penny Magazine. 2. History of the Bishopric of Lincoln. 3. A Guide to Infirm, Sick, and Dying Members of the Church of England. 4. The Temptation of our Blessed Lord. 5. Eclogæ Aristophanicæ, Part II. 6. Israel Hartmann. A Biography. 7. On the State of Man subsequent to the promulgation of Christianity, Part III. 8. Lectures principally on the Church Difficulties of the present Time. 9. English Alice. A Poem. 10. Stories and Catechisings in illustration of the Collects. 11. A Place of Repentance ; or, an Account of the London Colonial Training Institution and Ragged Dormitory. 12. Christian Union ; its Necessity, &c. 13. Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Rugby. 14. Money and its Influences. 15. The Anticleptic Gradus. 16. An Attempt to Illustrate the Chronology of the Old Testament. 17. Letters of the Rev. Dr. Pusey to the Earl of Shaftesbury and Sir J. Romilly, with Sir J. Romilly's Answer. 18. A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed. 19. A History of Ireland. 20. The Saints our Example. 21. Christianity in its Homely Aspects. 22. Pastoral Theology. 23. Extracts from the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. 24. A Textual Commentary on the Book of Psalms. 25. Michaud's History of the Crusades. 26. Sermons Doctrinal and Practical. 27. Hengstenberg's Revelation of St. John Expounded. 28. The Supremacy of St. Peter, &c. 29. The Analogy between the Miracles and Doctrines of Scripture. 30. Devotions from the Psalms. 31. Memoir of the Rev. R. A. Suckling, M.A. 32. Earlswood. 33. Walks after Wild Flowers. 34. Sunlight in the Clouds. 35. Lives of the Princesses of England. 36. Falconry in the Valley of the Indus. 37. Wordsworth's Occasional Sermons. 38. The Elements of Christian Science. 39. School Sermons. 40. The Christian Sacrifice of the Eucharist, &c. 41. America and the American Church. 42. Lectures on the Typical Character of the Jewish Tabernacle, &c. 43. Auricular Confession. 44. Thoughts on some Portions of the Revelation of St. John. 45. The Ark, and other Sermons. 46. The Future Human Kingdom of Christ. 47. Our New Parish. 48. Smith's Smaller Classical Dictionary. 49. History of Physical Astronomy. 50. The Emphatic New Testament. 51. Sermons addressed to a Country Congregation. 52. Sermons for Several Sundays. 53. A Companion to the Lord's Supper. 54. The English Psalter, adapted to the Ancient English Chants. 55. Oremus : Short Prayers in Verse. 56. An Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Creed of the Church of Rome, Part III. 57. Fairton Village. Miscellaneous.
-

- 1.—1. *The Penny Post.* September, 1852. London: John Henry Parker, Strand.
2. *The Churchman's Monthly Penny Magazine, and Guide to Christian Truth.* September, 1852. London: Wertheim and Macintosh, Paternoster-row.

FEELING as Churchmen under no small obligations to the publisher of the "Penny Post," for the many valuable works he has ushered into the world, characterized for the most part by a very distinctive Anglicanism of thought and feeling:—with a body of recent tracts from his literary workshop before us, which we cannot but regard with much admiration—owing to him also two such valuable publications as Cox's "Sympathies of the Continent," and Meyrick's

“ Church in Spain,” both of them lying now before us, it is not without much regret that we feel ourselves called upon to express an unfavourable opinion in reference to the “ Penny Post.” We should be sorry to be thought uncharitable by any honest man ; it is not pleasant to us, but exceedingly painful, on the contrary, to bring charges of Romanizing, and thereby run the risk of giving occasion, as it may seem, to the opponents of Church principles to rejoice in the bickerings of Churchmen amongst themselves. But we are conscientiously convinced that Romanizing language ought not to be tolerated ; even perhaps from *professed* Romanizers who own to the full extent of their ill principles ; and, though we would be the last to hunt any erring brother out of our communion, and constrain him to an act of mortal sin, yet we must think that it becomes all such unfortunate waverers, while they abstain from consummating their rebellion, to observe a melancholy silence at the least, and not occupy their leisure hours with devising and circulating slanders against that Church to which they still acknowledge their allegiance to be due.

Before we deal with the “ Penny Post,” we must be allowed one retrospective glance at the subject of Romanizing within the Church. The position held, then, by certain active Romanizers, the principal writers in the “ British Critic” a few years ago, was felt to be simply untenable ; their tone of undutiful disaffection to their own Church, was owned at last to be not only unprofitable, but a public scandal of the worst order. And so, that otherwise powerful periodical died a natural death, and its principal writers consummated their treason by openly deserting to the enemy. For some time after this catastrophe, open and direct Romanizing was not attempted in any professedly Church periodical. One of our ablest Quarterlies, though considered to represent what would be popularly entitled the Tractarian, as distinguished from the High-Church party, has manifested on the whole an apparently strong attachment to the English Church ; and though it has hesitated to speak of Rome’s sins with that strong abhorrence which characterizes the writings of all our greatest theologians, still, only in its very last number, it contains valuable articles, one on “ Mary, Queen of Scots,” and the other on “ Miss Sellon and Sisterhood,” which exhibit a distinctively Anglican, and equally distinctive Anti-Roman habit of thought, which it rejoiced us much to see, and which we have now great pleasure in acknowledging. We cannot say so much for a Monthly Review, “ The Ecclesiastic :” this contains too often directly Romanizing articles, of which we could specify many, if that were our present task, mixed, however, with some sound and valuable matter ; for some of the writers in this periodical seem to us to be earnest-hearted

Churchmen, still, we trust, sound at the core, though partially affected, at all events in sympathies, if not in externals, with the Romanizing leaven. But, then, this publication is professedly a party organ, and a somewhat extreme one, and therefore some allowance may be made for its occasional delinquencies.

But, what shall we say to a Penny Magazine, professedly written for the working classes, and that for the purpose of advocating the plain principles of the Church of England! a magazine unsuspectingly circulated and supported, mainly on the strength of its orthodox publisher's name, we believe, by a vast body of moderate Churchmen far and wide; designed to promote loyalty, reverence, and reasonable piety, but actually labouring to promote monkery and a slavish reverence for all monks; repeating the most silly fictions of the Middle Ages as religious truths, to be received implicitly by rich and poor; and scoffingly and wickedly reviling all "the powers that be;" teaching the working classes to despise all those that hold authority in Church and State, more especially the highest class of spiritual pastors, the bishops of our land; doing *in fine* its little all to familiarize men's minds quietly with the corruptions and abominations of Romanism, and to fill their hearts with the spirit of disaffection to our own true spiritual Mother.

These are no vague charges; we will substantiate them, one and all. We will choose the current number, the one for this month, by way of illustration of our strictures, and begin with the beginning. It opens, then, with an article entitled, "The Month and the Calendar," the black and red-letter days being catalogued at the head of the article, with the distinction of placing the letter in larger capitals. So far there may be said to be nothing objectionable, though any thing more *injudicious* could scarcely be imagined, any thing more likely to repel the sympathies of ninety-nine out of every hundred of the working classes, than this formal ecclesiastical procedure, this proclamation of *Churchianity*, to borrow a word from Dr. Cumming's not over-choice phraseology, by which we mean a churchmanship that rests in externals, instead of basing itself on the strong foundation of Gospel truth, and realizing the simplest, which are ever the highest truths, and making it its first business to preach "Christ Jesus and Him crucified:"—what a lesson may be learned from the "Churchman's Monthly Penny Magazine" in this respect! But this formal Calendar, in which Apostles and mediæval worthies are placed apparently upon a level, and truth and falsehood are enunciated as coming to us with the same authority in one breath, opens this thoroughly ill-conducted periodical. But to continue, "Giles Abbot and Confessor," stands of course first in the list, and of

him we are told that "S. Giles, or Egidius, a native of Athens, sold his property when very young, and disposed of it to charitable purposes; and then betook himself to a hermitage near Arles, that he might serve God in retirement. Afterwards he retreated to a more perfect solitude in a forest near Nismes, where he lived on the fruits of the earth, *and the milk of a kind that came to him at stated hours.*" And this silly rubbish is related as historical fact and religious truth to our English working classes, precisely as actual histories from Holy Scripture are narrated in the very same article, as coming to us on the same unquestioned and unquestionable testimony! Not a hint of the possibility of a doubt! What is this but manifestly teaching the dwellers in our cities, our toiling mechanics, who are already in many instances disposed to sneer and doubt, to scoff at all religion as alike contemptible? What is it but preparing the minds and hearts of our simpler peasantry for the full reception of all Rome's lying records, whenever the hour shall have arrived for their open and general circulation? But to proceed,—“Being discovered by the king, he received a grant of land, and founded a monastery, A.D. 673, in which he lived as abbot for fifty years.” Can it be faithful to the English Church, we ask, to teach her poorer children to sympathize in this unguarded way with institutions which she has rejected and discarded, and which none but her bitterest enemies now possess in this land? But mark what follows (the Italics are not ours here): “S. Giles is the *patron of beggars.*” The patron of beggars! Remark, not he “is called,” but he “is.” It follows that every profession of course has its patron saint, and this honourable profession, which is thus sensibly encouraged, is not without its special ghostly protector. We ask, *Can* any other than a Romanist have written this? Would any other than a Romanist, or than the silliest of men, tell the working classes of England, that S. Giles is the patron of beggars? The Italics, we presume, are substituted for the capitals that ought to be forthcoming on strictly Roman principles: or are they meant as a wretched blind? Shall we be told that they are supposed to mark a quotation? No, such an excuse cannot be accepted; for from first to last this entire Calendar professes to narrate historical and religious truth, truth which would command the assent of the reader: therefore we must look on this as an assertion of a fact, and we ask again, is *his* heart with Rome or England, who believes and asserts S. Giles to be the patron of beggars?

To conclude this one specimen of religious instruction for our working classes: “In the entrance of many towns in England

a church is dedicated to his memory, at which the cripples and beggars were wont to solicit alms." Alas for these halcyon days of milk-white hinds feeding ascetic hermits who deserted their posts of duty, of swarms of beggars at church porches, and their patron influencing the hearts of passers-by to encourage the respectable profession ! But we must not linger on the theme. Almost every sentence in this Calendar might present occasion for just and reasonable censure ; thus the mere ecclesiastical tradition, that the mother of the Blessed Virgin was called Anne, is given us as an indisputable fact, we presume, of course, on the infallible authority of Rome ; the later incidents of S. Matthew's life unrecorded in Scripture, which we have on comparatively doubtful testimony, are told us, as though tradition had the same absolute authority with Holy Writ itself ; of S. Cyprian it is of course *not* recorded that he opposed the pretensions of Rome in his day, since that would not have suited the writer's purposes. But we refrain from entering on these or other questions. And we will only allude in passing to the grossly injudicious selection which follows, of a passage from a tract of the Rev. H. Newland, the general bearing of which, to establish that all preachers should be sent by some lawful authority, is of course unexceptionable enough, save that such a point as this is not that which a wise man would select to insist on when there is so much of gross heathenism in our land, which many home-missionaries, who are not thus *sent*, despite all their failings, are earnestly labouring to overthrow ; this is another specimen of that sham Christianity, which is always ready to sacrifice the substance to the shade, and can talk while souls are perishing of apostolical order and succession, and of little else, instead of elevating the cross of a crucified Redeemer ; but the main injudiciousness consists in the slur which is here cast, whether intentionally or not, on missionaries : it is a story told at the expense of Dr. Woolf, who is called "the great missionary ;" he is represented as dumb-founded by a certain Greek bishop, who draws from him that he has no mission from his own Church, and we are not told that Dr. Woolf ever did procure such a mission. The impression is left that missionaries are somehow a troublesome, meddlesome kind of people : "but poor Woolf could not say that he had written the Bible, so he fell a thinking." Now we find no fault with Mr. Newland for telling this rather flippant story, but he has assuredly no reason to thank those who have thus drawn it from the context and placed it nakedly before the eyes of our poorer brethren. Its effect, thus used, must be to promote a spirit of mockery and irreverence. We are of course to understand that Dr. Woolf

could have no right, under any circumstances, to reprehend the idolatrous and superstitious practices of the Eastern Churches. Remark that thus far we have not a single word which is calculated to appeal to the heart of the poor man, and we shall scarcely find such a word throughout. Next comes a dry little essay on the Lessons in the Church Services, in the course of which we read, "The Song of Solomon is considered more fit for private than public reading, *but for no persons under the age of thirty years.*" Sound sense doubtless this passage exhibits; it is not at all likely to put bad notions into young and thoughtless people's heads, and make them open the book immediately actuated by a sinful yet natural curiosity! And this solemn repetition of a mere Jewish tradition of the Pharisees is binding, we are told, on Christians and on Churchmen; that none, however devotionally disposed or faithful-hearted, should read the Song of Songs "under the age of thirty years!" But we proceed. Next follows a chapter of a rather weak and wordy tale, called "The Heart-Stone," totally unsuited for publication in this periodical, though it might have done well enough as a tale published by itself; it narrates the fortunes of a persecuted priest, supposed for a long time to be a Roman Catholic, but eventually turning out a nonjuror and an ally of the Pretender's. William III. of course is abused most furiously, and *Protestantism* is placed in the most odious point of view. The tale is rather silly, and, so far, utterly pointless. It can certainly not benefit man, woman, or child, and it encourages a tone of thought and feeling which is hostile to all our institutions. Then comes a short devotional passage from Jones of Nayland, good of its kind, against which we have nothing to say. Then, after a short paragraph on the Diggings, comes a really remarkable article on "The Dark Ages," in which men are taught to despise all the charitable institutions of their age and country, in which our bishops are scoffingly reviled, in which the greatest reverence for the dark ages, and more especially for their monkery, is inculcated. It is the history of "Goldsmith Eligius." What say our readers to placing the following passages in the hands, not of our richer brethren, who possibly might profit by them in some measure, though we are far from condemning the friendly meetings which are here held up to ridicule, but in the hands of our working classes generally, teaching them to deride and despise their benefactors, and to judge harshly and bitterly those whom the Providence of God has placed above them? *Could* it be with any honest intention that such words were written? or were they traced, as we sincerely believe, by some secret Romanist, or Romanizer, who wishes to train the working classes to despise all

our national charities, and sigh for the days of monks doling out their pittance to beggars at convent doors? "Goldsmith Eligius, as we have seen, had a quaint way of his own of doing good, and what is more, of doing a vast amount of good. His name was not advertised as chairman of a patent good deed company, to dine so many times a year on choice viands and costly wines, under the care of a score of equally good stewards, and to the sound of pleasant music and trained voices,—*nor did his tenth donation and annual subscription ever make him blush in a list of benefactors.*" Of course all those unhappy people whose names do thus appear in the reports of all the valuable societies for the day are only seeking notoriety, and are amply repaid by the publicity they gain, so that none of the relieved and comforted need to trouble themselves with the faintest sentiment of gratitude. Such is plainly enough the lesson intended to be circulated, for that paper, remember, is written for the poor, not for the rich. There is very much more of the same kind-hearted and sensible banter, with jocose allusions to the ages of *darkness* and *ignorance*, by way of bringing out their vast superiority in faith and active charity. We are told how Eligius freed many slaves, and "if he could persuade them to become monks treated them with great respect, *honoured them as a class superior to that to which he belonged*, supplied them with clothes and all other necessities, sent them to different monasteries, and took a great deal of care of them." This is quoted from "a great author," unnamed; in all probability a Romanist, Alban Butler, or perhaps John Henry Newman. His next step was to build a monastery, and in spending all his substance on this, the king came to his aid, "so that, at length, others besides the goldsmith, *in those dark times*, began to be infected with this same desire of helping their poorer brethren,"—that is, by inducing them to herd together in monasteries, and separating them in many cases from their wives and children, and in many robbing society of its most useful members. Of course there is no charity equal to this in our Church and age. Then we are told, with an air of triumph, of the *many* MS. copies of the Holy Scriptures (some two or three at the utmost, and very frequently not one), which were stored away in monasteries. Then we hear how Eligius became a bishop, and this circumstance gives an opportunity to the writer to descant as follows, for the edification of our poor, in order to increase their loyalty, and love, and reverence for their own Mother Church: "He was not, indeed, exactly the type of a bishop of our own enlightened days; neither 'a grave elderly man, full of Greek, with sound views of the middle voice;' nor the acute editor of Greek tragedies; *nor a ready and pliant*

pamphleteer ;” (is this meant for the Bishop of Exeter?) “nor a quondam tutor of a noble or prince.” Now we ask, is such teaching as this to be endured in a penny publication professing to be written for the English working classes? It is not necessary to make any comments. It is quite manifest that the writer of this article prefers the practice and the type of the middle ages to that of Anglicanism, and is anxious to make the people share his own convictions on the subject. In fact, no one could have been surprised to read such a paper in the “Vindicator,” or any other openly Romish periodical, subscribed by the initials “J. H. N.” instead of “B. G. I.” Its bad intentions are manifest throughout.

Perhaps we shall be told that this is very uncharitable language ; that, after all, it might only be a sad want of common sense and an abundance of Tractarian sentimentality, which, without any ulterior views of mischief, caused the writer to pen this eulogium of the dark ages, and monkery, and this scoffing and depreciatory account of all the charities and prelates of our own Church and age. If so, we must say, that the total ignorance of the intellectual and spiritual needs of the working classes, exhibited in this and almost all the contents of this periodical, the indulgence of small party spite, the display of barren formalism, the want of a heart for the poor, the absence almost of reference to the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, are so many distinct proofs that if some Jesuit in English orders be *not* at work in this magazine, endeavouring quietly and unobtrusively to insinuate a liking for Romish errors and mediæval fictions into the hearts and minds of the English people, whilst he teaches them to despise all those that have been set over them, and to deride their efforts for their good ; we must at least recognize in the “Penny Post” a melancholy proof that the worst tendencies and practices of the “British Critic” linger yet within the English Church, assuming here a more offensive and mischievous, though a less prominent form, because not addressed to the learned and intellectual, but intended to be circulated, and actually circulated by tens of thousands, among our working classes, and coming to them with a species of authority from their parish priests, who support this periodical because they fancy it favourable in the main to Church principles, and hope from month to month that it will improve in tone and temper. If there be nothing worse behind, here at least is that Tractarian peevishness, that disposition to depreciate every thing Anglican and English, that tone of scoffing banter towards all the powers that be, that sentimental adulation of monks and monkery, that childish love of lying mediæval fictions, that resolution to close both eyes and ears to all the sins of Rome,

which we know to be some of the worst characteristics of the Ultra-Tractarian party.

Meanwhile, we earnestly recommend sound Churchmen, especially true pastors of their flocks, to circulate no more this mischievous periodical. In every respect, the "Churchman's Penny Magazine" may be said to be incalculably superior to it, as the perusal of the current number will prove. We read, indeed, there, of the "Holy Protestant Creed," which seems a somewhat strange and not peculiarly correct expression; and we perceive an injudicious condemnatory allusion to balls for the upper classes, in dealing with which this magazine surely goes beyond its tether; and sometimes, in back numbers, we have seen a tendency to talk of "the Finished Work" in a way we cannot approve, and which is too likely to lead astray, though we think it is elsewhere pointed out that "the work" is only "finished" by way of merit and satisfaction, and has to be appropriated individually, by a life of faith and love. Here, however, in the "Churchman's Penny Magazine," though the ecclesiastical element is by no means neglected (a Church history, that promises well, dating from the accession of Queen Elizabeth, has been just begun), the Gospel-tidings are the main feature; and the principal contributions manifestly proceed from men of God, whose hearts are with the working classes, who appreciate their needs, and know how to find their way to their consciences and understandings. With some few modifications, this magazine would leave nothing to desire; yet we admit there is room for a periodical more especially advocating Church principles.

11.—*History of the Bishopric of Lincoln, from its commencement at Sidnaceaster in Lindisse, &c. By ADAM STARK, Author of the History of Gainsburgh, &c.* London: Longmans. [8vo. pp. xviii. 529.]

THE author of this learned and interesting volume has already published several treatises on antiquarian subjects and local history, more especially in reference to Lincolnshire; but he has in the pages before us attempted a work of more general interest, and one which is connected with the general ecclesiastical history of England, from the earliest period to the Norman Conquest. It is characterized by a spirit of conscientious and elaborate research, which has brought to light facts of some importance, hitherto unobserved or slightly mentioned by historians, and has solved various intricate questions of antiquarian or historical interest. The author mentions as amongst the points worthy of attention, the discovery of an agreement or treaty between the

Archbishop of Canterbury and the Emperor Charlemagne, by which the former agreed to aid and assist the latter in invading the country; and the subsequent defeat of that invasion by Offa. He also offers some valuable remarks on the origin of the Scots and Picts, the early connexion of Ireland with the Scottish Highlands, and the establishment of a Celtic colony in the latter. Much interesting and curious antiquarian detail is occasionally introduced. As a specimen we would here cite a passage, which describes one of the most remarkable discoveries we remember to have heard of.

“The island of Iona, one of the Hebrides, received its name of Ikomkill, from its having contained in the early ages the Cell of Colomba, the apostle of the Picts, who, according to Bede, founded a monastery there, of which the ruins still remain. In the neighbouring island of Coll, at the foot of the mountain Boljo, there are, at this time, existing the remains of another monastery of great antiquity, the foundation of which is attributed, by tradition and the local histories, to one of the monks from Ikomkill, a man of great learning, whom Colomba had dispatched to form a pious establishment in Coll. Part of the ruins, in this latter island, have recently been removed by some of the poor natives, in order to procure materials for repairing their cabins. On pulling down one of the walls of considerable thickness, a vaulted apartment of fair dimensions was laid open, partly consisting of masonry and partly formed by an excavation from the mountain; around this cell or room appear a variety of shelves or ledges, neatly formed of slate, supported by stone brackets, and bearing upon them, in considerable numbers, what, according to modern phraseology, would be termed ‘Specimens of Geology.’ It would be difficult to give a detailed description of the great variety of metals and stones displayed in this collection; as in addition to an infinite number of British specimens there are many which are evidently brought from distant climates; but all are arranged, and in some degree classified in a manner which evinces a depth of science truly astonishing. Each specimen stands in a small tray or saucer of lead, which appears to have been cast in a mould of chalk or some other soft stone. The names of the specimens are indented or engraved upon the lead trays in old Latin, which in many instances still continues legible, though the majority of the names are quite unknown in modern times. Among those distinguishable are ‘Metall. Ferri Crud.’—‘Silex Cœrul.’—‘Opalus Rud.’—‘Aur. Pur.’ &c. &c. Most of the contracted words are finished with ciphers. Under one of the shelves were discovered an iron hammer and two hammer-heads of stone; one of them is of basalt, and the other a bright green silicious stone; and it is extraordinary that their shapes are very similar to those recommended by Mr. McAdam for hammers, in his works on road-making. In one part of the vault is a very ingenious composition of hardened clay, being obviously a model of the island, so far as relates to its geological structure. The

varieties of elevation appear to be distinguished by indented names; and it is a very extraordinary coincidence that the gently-rising hills are designated as 'Lond-hoehen'—whereas in modern German, the very same elevations are styled 'Land-höhen.'—pp. 505, 506.

To whatever date this museum may be ascribed, its existence is an indication of considerable knowledge of minerals. But at the same time it must be remembered that mines were worked in the earlier and middle ages; and wherever this was the case, a knowledge of mineralogy was the consequence; but certainly we could not have supposed that the study was carried out so systematically as this discovery proves it to have been.

III.—*A Guide to Infirm, Sick, and Dying Members of the Church of England.* By HENRY STRETTON, M.A., *Perpetual Curate of Church Hixon, near Stafford.* London: Masters. [12mo. pp. xvi. 380.]

THIS volume is a companion of the *Visitatio Infirmorum*, intended for the use of sick persons, comprising instructions addressed to them in connexion with the office for the Visitation of the Sick, and also a series of devotions. It appears to be modelled very closely on the *Visitatio Infirmorum*, and to be very carefully and judiciously written—following out the directions of the Church formularies in a style borrowed from our elder divines, and enriched by copious examples and extracts drawn from their pages.

IV.—*The Temptation of our Blessed Lord. A Series of Lectures.* By the Rev. T. TUNSTALL SMITH, M.A., *Vicar of Wirksworth.* London: Hatchard. [12mo. pp. 110.]

THIS series of discourses on the Temptation of our Lord is full of valuable matter, the result of much thought and study, and is eminently practical in its general tone.

V.—*Eclogæ Aristophanicæ, Part II. From the Birds, with English Notes, &c.* By C. C. FELTON, A.M. Edited by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A. London: Rivingtons. [12mo. pp. 130.]

THIS little volume is one of the valuable series of "Arnold's School Classics." It comprises the Greek text of "the Birds" of Aristophanes—that most singular drama, which bears a closer analogy to the tales of fairies or the Arabian Nights, than perhaps any other classical composition—illustrated by the very useful and full grammatical notes of Professor Felton of the University of Cambridge, United States.

VI.—*Israel Hartmann, as Youth, Husband, and Orphan Schoolmaster. A Biography from his Diary and Letters. Translated from the German by Mr. THOMPSON. With a Preface by the Rev. ROBERT BICKERSTETH, M.A., &c. London: Wertheim and Macintosh. [12mo. pp. 201.]*

THIS very beautiful and interesting memoir describes the life and opinions of a pious German layman, whose long and virtuous career of usefulness came to a close at the beginning of the present century. The religious character of his mind appears to have been derived from the Pietistic movement. We have been charmed with the perusal of this most interesting description of a phase of spiritual life, which, amidst all its evangelical simplicity and homeliness, presents a character so very national, and so different from the forms which religion assumes under corresponding circumstances in England. We commend this volume to our reader's attention.

VII.—*On the State of Man subsequent to the Promulgation of Christianity. Part III. London: Pickering. [18mo. pp. 291.]*

THE third part of this ecclesiastical history now before us extends from A.D. 602 to A.D. 1095. We must bear testimony to the ability and research which are manifested in all parts of this work, and to the philosophical spirit which lends interest to its details. We have seldom seen a more remarkable power of generalization, combined with a greater felicity in the choice of illustrative facts. The tone and spirit of the work incline in the direction of the modern ideas of philosophical religionism imported from Germany.

VIII.—*Lectures principally on the Church Difficulties of the Present Time. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A., &c. London: Cleaver. [12mo. pp. 264.]*

THIS volume will, we conclude, be gladly received, not only by a certain class of readers in the Church of England, but generally by Dissenters and Roman Catholics. Its keen and bitter attacks upon the episcopate of our Church will be grateful to all the parties referred to; while its advocacy of the Eucharist, as a true and proper sacrifice for the living and dead, of auricular confession, prayers for the dead, unction of the sick, reservation of the sacrament, &c., will be eagerly laid hold of for the purpose of proving the existence of Romanism in the English Church, or as so many concessions to that system. We cannot in the least wonder at the impressions which are prevalent in respect to all who hold High-Church views, when a writer like the author,

whose name appears prominently, on many occasions, as a leading and influential member of the Oxford movement, and of Church unions, and of educational combinations, and who dedicates his work, in a spirit of perfect cordiality, to the most conspicuous member of that party in the Church which has thrown itself into opposition to the union of Church and State, is heard expressing the class of opinions which are found in the volume before us.

IX.—*English Alice; a Poem, in Nine Cantos.* By ALEXANDER JOHN EVELYN, Esq. London: Pickering. [12mo. pp. 63.]

THE scene of this poem is laid at Seville, in the middle of the seventeenth century. It is a tale of love, but one of no ordinary description, inasmuch as the interest is made to depend chiefly on religious doubts and convictions, and on the dangers in which they involve the principal characters. The opening lines are as follows:—

“How sweet the hour, how fragrant, and how still,
When morning rises over gay Seville!
How rich the perfume from the orange-bower!
Soft lie the tears of night upon each flower!
Soon will those tears upon the rose be dry,
For swiftly mounts the sun in Eastern sky;
Soon will the tender influence of morn
Succumb beneath his angry glance of scorn.
Lo! at yon casement open to the ground,
That woos the fresh air, and the silvery sound
Of water, that in column'd gush upthrown,
Returns in spray, and tinkles on the stone,
A maiden stands, and drinks in all the scene—
The murm'ring fount, the flowers, each arbour green—
To seize the freshness of the early day
Ere wither'd yet by noontide's scorching ray.”

It will be admitted that the descriptive power here is very considerable; and that many of the ideas are not only striking in themselves, but happily expressed. The “tears of night,” and the water “in column'd gush upthrown,” are exceedingly good. We proceed to the description of the “maiden:”—

“No olive hues, imprest upon the cheek,
The burning pencil of a hot sun speak.
Fair is the maiden's cheek, where gently glows
The soften'd colours of the blushing rose;
In clustering curls her radiant ringlets spread,
And throw a golden glory round her head;
While from her eyes, so softly, deeply blue,
Beams forth a spirit loving, tender, true!”

“English Alice” thus portrayed, is beloved by “Alphonse,” who becomes a convert from Romish error, and whose life is consequently endangered. The catastrophe, including a scene in the Inquisition, and the escape of the lovers, is very powerfully wrought up. On the whole, we have been highly gratified by the perusal of this poem, which exhibits throughout very considerable poetical genius.

x.—*Stories and Catechisings in Illustration of the Collects; or, a Year with the First-Class Boys of Forley. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM JACKSON, M.A. Vol. I. London: Mozleys. [12mo.]*

THIS little volume will not merely be acceptable to Sunday scholars, but it will be useful to Sunday school teachers, and to the clergy, as furnishing excellent examples of the mode of communicating instruction in an interesting way, adapted to the capacities of children.

xi.—*A Place of Repentance; or, an Account of the London Colonial Training Institution and Ragged Dormitory, for the Reformation of Youthful and Adult Male Criminals, Great South-street, Westminster. By SAMUEL MARTIN, Minister of Westminster Chapel. London: Nisbet. [fcp. pp. 92.]*

THE author of this little work is evidently a benevolent and good man; and his description of the efforts which Christian charity is making for the reclaiming of criminals in London, and the success which has attended those efforts, is deeply interesting and gratifying. We would commend this highly instructive work to the attention of the clergy, as illustrating the effects of an active and self-denying charity, in cases where success might have appeared hopeless or impossible.

xii.—*Christian Union; its Necessity, the Grounds on which it may be hoped for, and the Obstacles to its attainment, &c. Six Sermons, by the Rev. J. PAUL, B.A., &c. London: Rivingtons. [8vo. pp. 118.]*

THE author of these sermons has taken up a subject of the highest importance and difficulty,—the possibility of union amongst Christians. He decides that, until Rome gives up its claim of infallibility, there is no use in dreaming of union with her; but he conceives that union may be attained between other communions at present separated. His remarks on this subject are deserving of an attentive consideration on the part of all who are desirous of promoting the interests of true religion.

- XIII.—*Sermons preached in the Parish Church of Rugby. By the Rev. J. MOULTRIE, M.A., Rector of Rugby.* London: J. W. Parker. [8vo. pp. 359.]

THE sermons in this volume appear in general to evince much thoughtfulness of mind, and soundness of doctrine, and to be adapted to an educated congregation. Their publication, which was only undertaken in consequence of certain circumstances which were recently the subject of public discussion, is a gratifying indication that the clergy of England are engaged in the efficient discharge of their sacred duties, and that when called on, they can place before the public undeniable proofs of their zeal and their capacity.

- XIV.—*Money and its Influences. A Tale translated from the German. By a LADY.* London: Wertheim and Macintosh. [fcp.]

A VERY interesting and well-written tale, exhibiting the hardening influence of riches, and the good use to which they may be applied. The moral of this tale is excellent.

- XV.—*The Anticleptic Gradus: founded on Quicherat's Thesaurus Poeticus Linguae Latinae. Edited by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A.* London: Rivingtons. [8vo. pp. 531.]

THE distinguishing characteristics of the Gradus here edited by Mr. Arnold are the supply of help to the student, in the form of materials to be worked up by himself, but not in the shape of ready-made lines; a separate notice of each meaning of the word treated; a selection of words nearly synonymous, and which may be used instead of each other; a selection of epithets, and of phrases. It will be found a sufficient Latin Dictionary for the best Latin Poets.

- XVI.—*An Attempt to illustrate the Chronology of the Old Testament, by a Reference to the Year of Jubilee. By the Rev. G. B. SANDFORD, M.A., &c.* London: Rivingtons. [fcp. pp. 116.]

THIS ingenious and thoughtful volume attempts to solve the difficulties of the Hebrew chronology, by reference to the year of jubilee. The author takes one very important date, the year of the Exodus, from Mr. Greswell's Dissertations, and from this and other sources the date of the accession of Solomon; and then, with the aid of his theory, works backwards and forwards, referring however to the valuable work above mentioned. The

views stated are put forward with candour and modesty, and the volume appears to throw considerable light on various difficulties.

xvii.—*Letters of the Rev. Dr. PUSEY to the Earl of Shaftesbury and Sir John Romilly, on their Imputations against the Tractarians, with Sir John Romilly's Answer. Reprinted from the "Morning Chronicle."* London: Masters.

WE have perused this correspondence with regret, on many accounts, but without the least surprise. We cannot wonder that Dr. Pusey and the Tractarians should be irritated at the imputation of a connexion with infidelity, considering that their views tend to the very opposite of infidelity; and that rationalism, and, generally speaking, all exercise of the human reason, in opposition to authority, are the subjects of their especial abhorrence. Nor is it for a moment to be supposed that Dr. Pusey and his followers are unbelievers. The absurdity of such a supposition, in the case of those whose fault is considered by their opponents to be excessive credulity, and a tendency to superstition, is self-evident; and so palpably is this the case, that we cannot conceive any intelligent and well-educated man entertaining such an idea for a moment. That Tractarians are Romanizing, that they have concealed Romanists amongst them, has often been said, and with more or less probability; but that they are actually unbelievers, or are desirous of promoting the cause of infidelity, could not be imagined by any one. We conceive, therefore, that Dr. Pusey has expended his labour in vain, in the attempt to prove, what no one will deny,—that Tractarians are not infidels. We should be very much surprised if we were to learn that the Earl of Shaftesbury intended to affirm that Dr. Pusey and his followers are unbelievers, or are desirous of promoting the spread of infidelity. But as we observe that the Tractarian press is in a state of violent excitement on the subject of the *monstrous* calumny and injustice which is said to have been perpetrated by the Earl of Shaftesbury in connecting Tractarianism with infidelity, we would offer a few words, in sad and solemn earnest on this painful subject.

Others may forget the past; but we can never forget the deep pain and anxiety with which, for a series of years, we saw the evidences of Christianity subverted by the leading Tractarian writers. Professor Powell, of Oxford, pointed out, at a very early stage of the controversy, the tendency of Tractarian speculations towards infidelity. As the teaching of Mr. Newman gained influence, the point steadfastly aimed at was to deny the exercise of human

reason ; to resolve all faith into a blind and unreasoning credulity ; to sap and undermine all the customary arguments in defence of Christianity ; to place the most fabulous legends, and the most gross impostures, on the same level of credibility with the miracles of the Old and New Testament. In this effort to equalize the human with the Divine, to place fables on a level with the Word of God, the faith itself received most serious injury. Men's minds were led to question first principles ; and many of those who had been induced to believe that there was no alternative between a blind impulsive acceptance of Rome's infallibility and general scepticism, chose the latter alternative. Some of the most leading minds amongst the infidel party were originally Tractarians, or were subject to the influence of their opinions. We would refer to the authority of the "*Nemesis of Faith*," as one instance ; but there are, unhappily, too many others ; and we can only express our most decided conviction that those who attempt to deny all connexion between Tractarianism and infidelity lay themselves open to a most crushing reply from any one who is competent to discuss the subject at length.

xviii.—*A Short Explanation of the Nicene Creed, for the use of persons beginning the study of Theology.* By A. P. FORBES, D.C.L., Bishop of Brechin. Oxford : J. H. Parker. [fcp. pp. 336.]

THE object of the author of this work is to remedy a defect which had met him in his own theological reading, the want of some treatise a little more technical and systematic than the great "*Exposition of the Creed*," by Bishop Pearson. He remarks that "amid the great revival of the last twenty years, as deeper views of God's truth have by his mercy been accorded to our aching hearts, a desire of a more systematic theology has almost of necessity been engendered." The work, which is based on Suicer's work on the Creed, and "other sources, both from the Latin and Greek Church," is indebted for the verification of its quotations, to "one, to whom posterity will render that homage which those who have the honour of knowing him accord to him now, the distinguished Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford."

xix.—*A History of Ireland.* Edited by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, M.A. London : Masters. [24mo. pp. 172.]

THIS is a very well-written and interesting compendium of Irish History. The author, however, is a nonjuror, and takes the part

of James II. He is also in many places more favourable to the Irish than the English cause in Ireland.

xx.—*The Saints our Example. By the Author of "Letters on Happiness."* London: Longmans. [12mo.]

THE authoress of this volume has here produced a series of lectures, which, for knowledge of Scripture, spirituality of tone, depth of thought, and weight of practical application, might fairly vie with the compositions of many an experienced preacher. The saints are here presented to us, in the right point of view, as examples and models of Christian conduct, and their very faults and failings are made conducive to edification and encouragement. All the Christian virtues and tempers are thus brought successively under review, and their practice is enforced by a most persuasive style of exhortation.

xxi.—*Christianity in its Homely Aspects: or, Discourses on various subjects, delivered in the Church of St. Andrew, Wells-street. By ALFRED BOWEN EVANS, one of its assistant Clergy, &c.* London: Masters. [12mo. pp. 262.]

THE author of this volume of sermons wishes that it may fall into the hands of any who may have entertained a prejudice against the church in which they were delivered; and assuredly, if these sermons represent the doctrines preached in that church, we cannot well imagine a better answer to charges often brought against its clergy. The style of the discourses is peculiar and antiquated, and there is a good deal of reasoning which we should think above the comprehension of the average run of congregations; but the doctrines and principles enunciated appear to have no such tendencies as should furnish any ground of jealousy; on the contrary, we should say that they are particularly free from such notions, and that the most Protestant congregation in the metropolis might listen to them without any other feeling than that of gratification and interest.

xxii.—*Pastoral Theology: the Theory of a Gospel Ministry. By A. VINET, Professor of Theology at Lausanne. Translated from the French.* Edinburgh: J. and T. Clark. [8vo. pp. 316.]

WE have not read the whole of this book, but we can say that all we have seen appears to be highly instructive, and written in a practical and religious spirit. The remarks on preaching con-

tain a great amount of practical suggestions derived from all quarters, and cannot fail to be eminently useful to any clergyman who may peruse them. The author appears to be a man of remarkable soundness of mind and correctness of view, with, of course, some mistaken notions, which are connected with his position in a community which has lost the ordinary succession of the ministry.

XXIII.—*Extracts from the Reports of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools: intended chiefly for the use of the Managers and Teachers of such elementary Schools as are not receiving Government Aid.* London: Longmans. [12mo. pp. 316.]

THE Reports of the Government Inspectors of Schools, published from time to time, are comprised in a series of bulky volumes, including a vast mass of educational statistics, combined with much matter of more practical usefulness, and more general interest. The editor of the work before us has brought together, within the compass of one very moderate-sized volume, all the valuable suggestions which the experience of the different school inspectors has embodied in their Reports. The matter is carefully and judiciously arranged, and we recommend the volume in the strongest terms to all who are interested in the management of schools.

XXIV.—*A Textual Commentary on the Book of Psalms.* By H. M. CHAMPNEY, Author of an "Index to Scripture Readings," &c. London: Bagster. [24mo.]

THE great value of a work like this, is its tendency to induce habits of patient and attentive observation and study of Scripture. It may at first sight appear of little use to accumulate so large a number of parallel passages, in elucidation of each verse of the Psalms; many of which are not directly illustrative of the meaning; but we are persuaded, that those who enter on the study of the Psalms with the aid of this little volume, will find, after a short essay, that it is calculated to contribute most materially to the increase of their knowledge of Scripture, and to their spiritual improvement. The reader is supposed, in making use of this Commentary, to have his Bible open at the Psalm which he is about to examine, and after reading a verse, to read the lines connected with it in the Commentary, which consist of texts, given at such length as to supersede the necessity of further reference. We can only say, that wherever we have consulted the references, the selection appears to have been most carefully and satisfactorily made.

xxv.—*Michaud's History of the Crusades. Translated from the French by W. ROBSON. In 3 vols. London: Routledge. [12mo.]*

THIS highly interesting and important work has now been brought to a close by the publication of the third and last volume. We heartily commend it to the notice of our readers, as comprehending a full and elaborate survey of the most extraordinary events of the middle ages, involving consequences of the highest importance, both political and religious. The work before us is one which holds a conspicuous place amongst the great historical writings of our time; and we doubt not that the public will extensively appreciate the benefit which has been conferred on us by a translation, which has made so valuable an accession to our literature.

xxvi.—*Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical. By the Rev. W. ARCHER BUTLER, M.A., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin, &c. Edited by the Rev. T. WOODWARD, M.A., Vicar of Mullingar. Second Edition. Dublin: Hodges and Smith; Cambridge: MacMillan. [8vo. pp. lxiv. 422.]*

WE sincerely rejoice to see that a second edition of this remarkable volume of sermons has been called for. Professor Archer Butler was an example of what Ireland is capable of producing; and we believe that the persecution through which the clergy of Ireland have been passing for so many years, is raising up many men, who, in ability and devotedness, if not in high philosophical attainment, are worthy of being countrymen of Professor Butler. We have no fear for the Church which can produce such men, and which can throw itself so nobly into the missionary work: its cause will be sustained by more than human power.

xxvii.—*The Revelation of St. John, expounded for those who search the Scriptures. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated by the Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, &c. In 2 vols. Edinburgh: J. and T. Clark. [8vo.]*

How it comes to pass that a presbyterian clergyman, as we presume the translator of this book to be, can undertake to commend an exposition of the Apocalypse, which sees every where Rome pagan, and no where Rome papal in the Revelations, is a matter of some surprise. We live, however, in strange times. The translator is evidently not without misgivings as to the cha-

racter of Hengstenberg's views, and feels himself bound to dissent expressly from one passage, in which the doctrine of purgatory is taught! Without doubt, Dr. Hengstenberg's commentary is replete with learning and ingenious reasoning, and will occupy a distinguished place in theology.

xxviii.—*The Supremacy of St. Peter, &c. Lectures delivered by the Rev. JOHN S. MCCORRY, M.Ap.* Edinburgh: Marsh and Beattie. [12mo. pp. 175.]

A SERIES of lectures, by a Romish priest, vindicating the papal supremacy, in the style of boasting and insolence which is so peculiarly the characteristic of modern Roman Catholic writers. It is invariably the case, that pretensions of the most extravagant description are put forward by Romish advocates, and supported by evidence which falls to pieces the moment it is submitted to examination; yet, the next week, the same testimony is put forward again, with as much assurance as if it had never been touched.

xxix.—*The Analogy between the Miracles and Doctrines of Scripture.* By the Rev. FRANCIS J. JAMESON, B.A., &c. Cambridge: MacMillan. [12mo.]

THIS essay, which obtained the Norrisian prize, professes to prove that the progression of revealed doctrines, and the introduction of miracles in the different steps of that progression, were subject to one law. It is intended to meet the demands of the philosophy of progress which seeks for a general law of development, into which it may resolve all religious phenomena. The author appears to have treated his subject with much thoughtfulness and ability.

xxx.—*Devotions from the Psalms.* Selected by CLARA M. BRET-
TINGHAM. London: Masters. [24mo.]

THIS little manual comprises selections from the Psalms for every hour of the day and night, and also for special occasions. It will be an acceptable gift to all serious and devoutly disposed persons.

xxxi.—*A Short Memoir of the Rev. Robert Alfred Suckling, M.A., late Perpetual Curate of Bussage, &c.* By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS, B.D. London: Masters. [fcp. pp. 314.]

WHATEVER may be the religious opinions of the readers of this

memoir, we feel assured that but one feeling can exist towards the admirable clergyman who is its subject, and whose short life exhibited so beautiful an example of Christian earnestness and love. Descended from an ancient family, and heir to its possessions, an early age saw him deprived, with his own consent, of his natural inheritance, and retiring from the naval service to the more congenial office of the Christian ministry. Having made himself somewhat conspicuous for ultra opinions of a High-Church character at Cambridge, he was refused ordination by the then Bishop of Ely; but Archdeacon Thorpe appointed him to the curacy of Bemerton, where he laboured for some years, in a spirit of entire devotion to the souls of his parishioners. His opinions and practice during this time appear to have been entirely formed on the highest Tractarian theories, continual evidence of which is supplied by the beautiful and Christian letters written at this period, which the editor has introduced into his Memoir. He subsequently was appointed to the charge of a new church at Bussage, where he was instrumental in making a remarkable change in the population, and in establishing a house of refuge for female penitents. During these labours of love, a change appears to have come over his views; some alienation in feelings and sympathies between him and the party to which he had been attached took place. He was unable to enter into their views with reference to Church and State, or to the Gorham question. Some coolness appears to have been shown on their part, as to one who had forgotten the duty of contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. It is added, that this division was healed by the agitation on the papal aggression, which appeared to him to be a combination of infidels with religious partisans. We think, however, that, judging from his letters, he appears to have been from this time more and more emancipated from party ties. In a letter, which he wrote shortly before his death, he expresses his opinion, that "one heaven can contain Dr. Pusey and Mr. Close, Massillon, Chalmers, Bourdaloue, and D'Aubigné, Mr. Cheyne, and Robert Anderson, and many others, who, though now fighting the same battle, yet feel constrained to stand aloof one from the other." We do not think that any Tractarian would have expressed himself in terms like these.

XXXII.—*Earlwood; or, Lights and Shadows of the Anglican Church.* By CHARLOTTE ANLEY, *Author of Miriam, &c.* London: Hatchard. [18mo.]

A PLEASING and gracefully-written tale, detailing the process by which persons of piety are sometimes perverted to Romish error,

and the prostration of moral principle which ensues, and also describing the restoration of those who have for a time been misled by teaching essentially Romish.

XXXIII.—*Walks after Wild Flowers; or, the Botany of the Bohereens.* By RICHARD DOWDEN (RICHARD). London: Van Voorst. [18mo. pp. 232.]

RICHARD DOWDEN is not only a botanist but a poet, as far as richness of imagery and imagination, and grace of diction, can make one. His volume is redolent of genius throughout, and is certainly one of the most charming works on botany we have ever met.

XXXIV.—*Sunlight in the Clouds. Some Providences in a Life Time, &c.* London: Mozleys.

A VERY pleasing collection of tales, exhibiting the quiet working of religion in humble life, and wearing a great appearance of reality.

XXXV.—*Lives of the Princesses of England, from the Norman Conquest.* By MARY ANNE EVERETT GREEN. Vol. IV. London: Colburn. [12mo.]

WE have already noticed the earlier part of this work with the praise which its distinguished merit demands: in literary ability, indeed, the authoress is scarcely, if at all, inferior to Miss Strickland. And her work is most successfully continued in the volume now before us, which, in addition to a long memoir of Margaret, Queen of Scotland—a subject ably treated by Miss Strickland—comprises short but interesting notices of three princesses, daughters of King Edward IV.

XXXVI.—*Falconry in the Valley of the Indus.* By RICHARD F. BURTON, Lieutenant, Bombay Army. London: Van Voorst. [12mo. pp. 107.]

A BRILLIANT and animated description of the author's adventures and wild sports in India, accompanied by some amusing details of his earlier life in England.

XXXVII.—*Occasional Sermons preached in Westminster.* By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Fourth Series. *On the Church of Ireland.* London: Rivingtons. [8vo.]

AMONGST the many valuable publications for which the Church

is indebted to Dr. Wordsworth, the volume before us is not the least, either in learning, ability, or general usefulness. Dr. Wordsworth has in this series of discourses entered at length into a question on which the grossest mistakes have been prevalent, but which recent events have, we trust, been aiding to remove. Our conviction is, that the battle with Romanism is to be fought chiefly in Ireland; and that if the Church of England does her duty to the cause of truth in that country, she will be abundantly rewarded, both temporally and spiritually. We hope to return to Dr. Wordsworth's work on a future occasion; and, in the mean time, commend it strongly to all who wish well to our Zion.

xxxviii.—*The Elements of Christian Science. A Treatise upon Moral Philosophy and Practice. By WILLIAM ADAMS, S.T.P., Presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in the Diocese of Wisconsin. Philadelphia: Hoolar.*

How a presbyter of the diocese of Wisconsin can have found time to put together the thoughtful and elaborate volume before us, is a matter of some wonder. The author explains his object to be, to discover, define, and specify distinctly, the various faculties of the moral constitution of man, and so to classify them that they may assume a definite, scientific, and practical form. To do this he considers them in the twofold point of view—as in themselves first; and, secondly, their relation to those other external fixed points which bear upon moral life. The treatise is divided into six books relating to, 1. Human Nature; 2. The Conscience; 3. The Spiritual Reason; 4. The Heart, or Affections; 5. The Home and its Affections; 6. The Human Will.

xxxix.—*School Sermons; preached in the Chapel of Marlborough College. By MATTHEW WILKINSON, D.D., Master of Marlborough College, &c. London: Murray.*

SERMONS addressed to schools are becoming a not unimportant item in the literature of the times. From what we have seen of the volume now before us, we are of opinion that it deserves a high rank amongst publications of the kind; it is practical, earnest, affectionate, and instructive; and shuns, of course, all party views and theological controversies.

xl.—*The Christian Sacrifice of the Eucharist, &c. By GEORGE HAY FORBES. Edinburgh: Lendrum.*

A VERY learned and elaborate treatise, bringing the testimonies

of the Fathers to bear on the doctrine of the Eucharist, and taking views of that doctrine in accordance with Patristic teaching.

XL1.—*America, and the American Church.* By the Rev. HENRY CASWELL, M.A., Vicar of Figheldean. Second Edition. London: Mozleys.

THIS work, which is of standard authority in all that relates to the American Church, is of peculiar interest now in reference to the question of convocations and synods, exhibiting as it does the constitution and practice of the American Church in this respect.

XLII.—*Lectures on the Typical Character of the Jewish Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Sacrifices, preached during Lent, 1850.* By FORSTER G. SIMPSON, B.A., Curate of Ickworth. London: T. D. Thompson; Hamilton and Adams.

THE subjects of these lectures are tolerably familiar to most congregations; nor have we observed any peculiarity in the mode in which they are here treated. The sermons seem good and useful discourses, but not much out of the usual class.

XLIII.—*Auricular Confession, &c.* By WILLIAM PEARCE, Esq. Second Edition. London: Painter.

A BRIEF but effective argument against the Romish practice of confession, and against the attempts to introduce that practice amongst ourselves.

XLIV.—*Thoughts on some Portions of the Revelation of St. John the Divine.* By the Rev. EDWARD HUNTINGFORD, B.C.L., late Fellow of New College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. [12mo. pp. 176.]

THE object of this little work, as stated by the author in his Preface, is to give some assistance to the ordinary reader of the holy Scriptures in his meditations on those portions of the Revelation which are generally supposed to have been fulfilled. We may add, that the author identifies the Bishop of Rome with the beast of the Apocalypse. His work appears to be written with care, and to be well calculated to accomplish its purpose.

XLV.—*The Ark, and other Sermons, preached in the Parish Church of High Wycombe.* By the Rev. RICHARD BELLIS, Curate, &c. London: Painter.

A VOLUME of scriptural discourses evincing much earnestness of

mind, and a high sense of the responsibility devolving on the Christian preacher. They are warmly recommended in a Preface by Dr. McCaul.

XLVI.—*The Future Human Kingdom of Christ ; or, Man's Heaven to be this Earth, &c.* By the Rev. D. J. HEATH, M.A., Vicar of Brading, Isle of Wight, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London: J. W. Parker. [8vo. pp. 372.]

THIS work consists of an elaborate inquiry into the doctrines of Scripture, with a view to prove that Christ will reign personally for ever on earth, and that man's heaven will be here, and here only.

XLVII.—*Our New Parish, its Privileges and Progress.* By HARRIET E. FOURDRINIER, Authoress of "*Hints for Happy Hours.*" London: Pickering. [Fcp. pp. 328.]

A SERIES of tales in connexion with the formation and progress of a new parish. The earlier part of the volume is taken up with descriptions of the Clergy who were appointed, and their difficulties and efforts to advance the cause of religion; the first parish clerk—a very interesting sketch; and then, last, but not least, the consecration of the new church. Then comes the first tale, "The Collier," a very sad and tragic tale of humble life, most powerfully told, pointing out the evil results of bad company. The other tales in the volume are written with equal ability; we would specify "Mordaunt" as exhibiting no ordinary power of working on the feelings. The tone, throughout, is good and healthy.

XLVIII.—*A Smaller Classical Dictionary of Biography, Mythology, and Geography. Abridged from the Larger Dictionary.* By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. London: Murray. [Cr. 8vo. pp. 464.]

THE reputation of Dr. Smith's Larger Classical Dictionary is perfectly established; but it is rather too bulky a volume for the younger classes in schools, for whose use this beautiful and accurate abridgment, illustrated with two hundred woodcuts, is now published. The care with which all allusions calculated to injure morality are avoided in this work renders it peculiarly adapted to the use of young persons.

XLIX.—*History of Physical Astronomy, from the Earliest Ages to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century. Comprehending a detailed Account of the Establishment of the Theory of Gravitation by Newton, and its Development by his Successors; with an Exposition of the Progress of Research on all the other subjects of Celestial Physics.* By ROBERT GRANT, F.R.A.S. London: Baldwin. [8vo. pp. 637.]

THE mere title of this work will convey some notion of its wide extent and importance. It is a complete treatise on the subject to which it refers—the history of physical astronomy, tracing the results of the wonderful discoveries of Newton through all their details, theoretical and practical, down to the recent labours of Airy, Herschell, and Lord Rosse. We trust that the circulation of this work will be such as to reward, in some degree, the research and labour which have evidently been bestowed upon it.

L.—*The Emphatic New Testament, according to the Authorized Version, compared with the Various Readings of the Vatican Manuscript. The Four Gospels. Edited, with an Introductory Essay on Greek Emphasis, by JOHN TAYLOR, Author of "Junius Identified," &c.* London: Taylor, Walton, and Maberly.

THIS work is an attempt to mark all the emphatic words in the New Testament, on a certain system of rules founded on the action of the article in the original text, or on the other grammatical peculiarities of the Greek, which are not transferred into the existing translation. Mr. Taylor makes the text of the Vatican MS. the basis of his edition, correcting the authorized version by it. The idea of his work is an ingenious one, but we should doubt whether his labours will throw much additional light on the subject.

LI.—*Sermons addressed to a Country Congregation; together with those preached before the University of Cambridge, in January, 1851.* By the Rev. E. THORNTON CODD, M.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, &c. London: Masters.

A CONGREGATION which hears discourses like these every Sunday has many advantages. The writer has, as he informs us in his Preface, studied to prepare sermons adapted to a rural congregation, and he lays down principles which show that his theory on the subject is excellent; but we are not so certain that his application of that theory is successful. His sermons are plain and good, but they are not very interesting, we think.

LII.—*Sermons for several Sundays.* By WILLIAM KEATING, M.A., Curate of Stalisfield, in the Diocese of Canterbury. London: Hope and Co.

THESE sermons are very poetical compositions, full of imagery, and striking thoughts, and elegant phraseology—rather of the butterfly species. We cannot say that we think them models of what parochial sermons should be.

LIII.—*A Companion to the Lord's Supper.* By the Rev. G. F. DE TEISSIER, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. London: Hatchard.

As cold and dry a book as we have ever met with on the subject of the Holy Communion.

LIV.—*The English Psalter, adapted to the Ancient Ecclesiastical Chants. Specimens, with the Preface and Introduction.* London: Masters.

THIS is a well-meant publication. The greater part of it is occupied by a Preface, urging the expediency of chanting the psalter, and other parts of the services, to the old ecclesiastical chants. The author has a great many good arguments in favour of his view. After all, however, the popular taste does not, at present, meet with what it relishes, in those ecclesiastical chants; a service consisting of them only is almost always unpopular. As to mere *popularity*, we believe, the old parish choirs, with fiddles, bassoons, &c., were the most popular. Moreover, there is another difficulty in the way, which the author mentions, but does not solve:—

“There is only one other objection that we shall notice, as likely to be brought against the suggestions contained in these pages; and this is, that they will seem to many to have a tendency towards the corrupt practices of the Church of Rome; and it will probably be adduced, in proof of this, that many persons, who have begun by inculcating and practising what is here recommended, have ended by leaving their own Church, and attaching themselves to that communion. This is certainly an objection with which it is very difficult to deal; partly because there is, no doubt, *some* foundation for it, in the actual facts of the case; and partly, also, because it requires a rather acute, and, therefore, not altogether common intellect, as well as some learning, on the part of an objector himself, to enable him to appreciate, even when it is pointed out to him, the precise line that separates what is strictly primitive and apostolical, from what is only a modern corruption of it.”—p. lxxxiv.

LV.—*Oremus: Short Prayers in Verse for Sundays and Holidays, suggested by the Services of the Church of England.* London: Rivingtons.

A PLEASING collection of short poems, in many instances breathing the thoughts of our collects and other formularies. We cite one or two examples:—

“FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

I.

“Raise up Thy power,
O Lord, and come among us, and with might
Succour thy soldiers in the fearful fight
Of sin's dark hour.

II.

“Good Lord, deliver
Thy servants, for the sake of thy dear Son;
Help them their daily duteous course to run,
And shield them ever.

III.

“So shall they cherish
Thy love on earth, and bless thy holy name,
And chant glad adoration to the Lamb,
When time shall perish.”

The following pleasing lines are on St. John the Evangelist's Day:—

“O Lord of mercy, cheer our sight
With those pure rays which, beaming bright
Truth from the fount of Gospel light,
Thy Church illumine;

“And, by her ministry, dispel
The darkling mists of Death and Hell,
That ages yet unborn may tell
How that deep gloom,

“Once lowering o'er their dark abyss,
Melted in radiant floods of bliss,
At his sure Word, that was, and is,
And is to come!”

LVI.—*An Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Creed of the Church of Rome. Part III.: The Sacrifices of the Mass and Transubstantiation.* By CHARLES SMITH, B.D., Rector of Newton, Suffolk, &c. London: J. W. Parker.

It is certainly very possible to connect Catholic truths with the most corrupt definitions in some way; yet still we must

express considerable doubt whether this is the most profitable way to induce meditation on the great mysteries of religion. We should suppose, for instance, that if it be desirable to fix the mind on the fact, that our Saviour's whole life was a sacrifice, it might be advisable to take some other opportunity of doing this besides educating it as a kind of moral from the Romish doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass.

LVII.—*Fairton Village, or Wesleyan Beginnings.* Oxford and London: J. H. Parker. 1852.

A STORY of sound principles, simply told, and well suited to a parochial lending library.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AMONGST the publications now before us, we have to notice a Charge, by the Archbishop of Dublin, on "The Claims of Truth and Unity," expressing the opinions of that able prelate on the subject of union amongst Christians, and the points connected with it, on the evils of party, and on the mode of procedure in controversy, together with remarks on the question of Church Government in Synods, and on the Society for promoting the Rights of Conscience. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Melbourne, by the Right Rev. Dr. Perry, Bishop of Melbourne (J. W. Parker), comprises much interesting matter in relation to the discharge of pastoral duties under the peculiar circumstances in which the Church is placed in that diocese. Archdeacon Law's Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Wells (Hamilton, Adams, and Co.), points out, in a very striking way, the evils affecting the Church of England at present, and refers to the remedy, in the increase of a spirit of vital religion.

Amongst separate Sermons, we would notice, with especial commendation, a Discourse by the Rev. W. Webster, M.A., King's College, "An Evangelical Ministry the Strength of the Nation" (Seeleys), as furnishing a most gratifying example of evangelical teaching, with remarkable freedom from party feeling; a Sermon by the Rev. Alex. Watson, "Public Ordinances an effectual Administration of Divine Pardon" (Masters), in opposition to a view of Absolution put forward by the pervert Maskell; "Cost an Element of Sacrifice," a Sermon by the Rev. Philip Hale, B.A. (Whittaker). We have also seen several series of Sermons on the Creed of Pope Pius IV., by the Rev. J. N. Griffin, A.B. (Seeleys), which exhibit very great research and keenness of argument. We should think them extremely well suited for circulation amongst Roman Catholics.

Amongst other tracts and pamphlets, we have to mention, "A Plea for what is left of the Cathedrals," by the Rev. J. Jebb (Rivingtons)—one of the most excellent and learned tracts we have seen in reference to the subject—but, as it seems, suggesting theories which are unsuitable to our actual state; a "Letter of Advice to all Members of the Church of England," concerning Daily Service (Masters), a reprint of an old tract published in 1704; "A Short Letter to the Servants in Great Britain" (Masters); "The Church's Shadow;" "Teaching of the Meeting House, and Teaching of the Church;" "Holy Stone;" "Little Ruth Gray"—cheap tracts published by Mr. Masters; A Pilgrimage to Canterbury, in 1852, by Rev. H. Caswall, very pleasingly written; "The Papal Aggression to be met by the Revival of Diocesan Synods," by Rev. W. Pound; "Synodal Action necessary to the Church," by Rev. H. Caswall—publications in favour of Synodal Action; "England, and Ireland, or Exeter!" by "a Cambridge Monk" (Hatchard)—comprising a view of the alterations in the Articles and Catechism supposed necessary to carry out High-Church views.

"The Cyclopædia Bibliographica," published by Mr. Darling, of which a number is before us, appears to be a most valuable addition to Bibliography. "Suggestions on the Present Condition of Ireland, and on Government Aid for carrying out an Efficient Railway System," by C. Locock Webb, Esq. (Smith, Elder, and Co.), contains much important statistical information on the decrease of population in Ireland, and suggests the expediency of advances to complete railroads. We may also mention, as deserving of attention, "A Letter to the Right Hon. J. W. Henley," on Life Assurance Associations, by R. Christie, Esq.; "What is Education?" a Letter to the Earl of Derby, by the Rev. J. Taylor, M.A.—a very interesting and important pamphlet; "A Reflective Letter to the Agricultural Society," by the Rev. H. Cole (Seeleys), on the inhumanity of fattening beasts; "Periodical Savings," by Alex. Robertson (Orr)—a full description of Savings Banks, Benefit Clubs, &c.; "Hints on Education," by J. Willamy, &c.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

EUROPE.

FRANCE.—The Government in France is more and more evidently throwing itself into the hands of the Church of Rome, and the consequence is the persecution to a greater or less extent of Protestantism. The most untiring efforts are made to advance the influence of Romanism. The President, on all occasions, is seen paying court to the bishops, while they reciprocate his attentions by the most adulatory expressions. In one of the recent circulars of the bishops he was spoken of as “this man of God.”

Mgr. Pallegoix, Romish Bishop of Mallos, and Vicar Apostolical of Siam, lately presented to the President of the Republic two young Siamese, who have come to France for their education. They presented the following address in their own language to the President:—

“We, Xoru and Keo, natives of the kingdom Thai, prostrate ourselves before him who governs France. We pray the Lord of heaven to protect your highness, so that you may govern this kingdom with peace and glory, and that He may accord you a prosperous life for a thousand years.” (Terms used in Siam to express ardent wishes for the prosperity and longevity of sovereigns.)

They then offered the Prince, one, a Japan box, encrusted with mother of pearl, and the other, a book of Chinese pictures. The Prince expressed his surprise that he should be known to the King of Siam; but he was told that his uncle’s name was well known in Siam, and that his picture was to be found there frequently. A treaty of commerce between the two countries was then talked of, and the interview concluded with Louis Napoleon giving to each of the lads a gold pin surmounted by an eagle, holding in its beak a laurel branch, adorned with brilliants.

It is worthy of remark that the person chosen lately to negotiate at the court of Austria, in reference to the marriage of the President, was the Archbishop of Paris.

The effects of the intimate alliance between the State and Romanism are seen in a tone of increased arrogance and violence on the part of the latter. One of the leading journals, the “Pays,” lately proceeded to such lengths, that it has received privately a remonstrance from an official source against the violence of its language in calling for a sort of crusade of France and other Roman Catholic states, against all the Protestant powers of Europe.

The Bishop of Luçon refused to allow a *Te Deum* to be sung in the churches of his diocese on the day of the *Fête Napoleon*, on the ground that no steps had yet been taken by the minister of public worship for the exhumation of the body of a Protestant, who, in the absence of a Protestant pastor in the place, had been privately interred by order of the municipal authorities in the cemetery of Cugand in the Vendée.

English Romanism is in every way supported and encouraged in France.

The Archbishop of Cambrai, at the closing of his diocesan synod, announced to the clergy that he had received a letter from Cardinal Wiseman, stating that the Catholics of England were unable to raise the funds necessary to pay the expenses incurred by Dr. Newman in the affair of Dr. Achilli, and accordingly soliciting relief from their brethren of the Continent. In consequence, the archbishop intimated that he would be happy to receive offerings from the clergy and the faithful, and he himself gave 200*fr.* The subscription opened for the same purpose by the Paris "Univers" amounts to between 700*fr.* and 800*fr.*

The fourth Centenary of Notre Dame-de-Grace, at Cambrai, and the opening of the Jubilee, granted by the Pope, on the occasion, concluded on Sunday last, by the inauguration and benediction of the miraculous picture of the Virgin, said to have been painted by St. Luke, and of the miraculous statue of the Virgin, which, according to tradition, caught in her apron the balls of a besieging general. The latter was, in 1792, despoiled of its jewels, and thrown aside in a corner of the sacristy, whence it was afterwards removed, and has now been replaced in its original position on the ramparts. The picture has been replaced in the church. In the procession, which extended upwards of a mile in length, a number of young maidens in opera-girl muslin, with wings glued to their shoulders, personified angels. Cardinal Wiseman was the presiding genius. The Archbishop of Cambrai and the Bishops of Nevers and Angers were also present, together with an immense body of clergy.

Three new establishments of the order of Dominicans, installed three years ago by the Père Lacordaire in the Maison des Carmes, at Paris, have been opened at Flavigny, in the Côte d'Or, at Nancy, and at Grenoble. The Franciscans have recently established themselves at Amiens. Cardinal Wiseman conducted the ceremony of inauguration in the presence of the Bishop of Amiens, his chapter, and the clergy of the city. Franciscan monks, in their coarse brown dress, with a cord round the waist, are already to be met with in the streets of Paris.

The "Union de l'Ouest" contains an account of divers miracles said to have taken place on the holy mountain of La Salette on the 1st of July, the eve of the *fête* of the Visitation of the Virgin. A young girl from the religious establishment of the Visitation at Valence, who had been for three months completely blind from an attack of

gutta serena, on having the sacrament administered to her, suddenly recovered her sight, and with her eyes fixed on a statue of the Virgin, exclaimed, "*Ma bonne mère, je vous vois !*"—A woman, nearly sixty years of age, who, for the last nineteen years, had not had the use of her right arm in consequence of a dislocation, suddenly swinging round the once paralyzed limb, exclaimed, "And I also am cured!"—Another woman, for many years paralytic, having ascended the mountain with the aid of crutches, felt, on the first day of the *neuvaine*, a sensation as if life was coming into her legs; and on the last day, after having received the communion, went without any assistance to the Cross of the Assumption, where she hung up her crutches!

A subscription is now in progress for the purpose of raising a sanctuary to the Virgin on the mountain of La Salette, in attestation of the miraculous appearance to two young shepherds. The following paragraph from a French journal is worthy of remark:—

"An anonymous *brochure* recounts that the Virgin, shining with splendour like that of the sun, her brow encircled with a diadem, the breast ornamented with a figure of Christ, presented herself to two young shepherds. She made them sit beside her on a large stone, and pronounced these words: 'Say to my people that if they do not become converted a great famine will happen—but if they return to my Son with an humble and penitent heart, the rocks and stones themselves will be covered with wheat.' This is assuredly a somewhat odd apparition and warning; and yet the *brochure* of which we speak, hawked about and spread profusely through the country, has convinced some peasants. Pilgrims have gone to the mountain. What was the duty of the spiritual guides of these blessed populations? Why, to take information, to inquire into the source of the miracle, to confound imposture, and to establish the truth. Far from doing so, the fact is taken as authentic; the memory of it is sought to be perpetuated; the generosity of the public is invoked, and that despite of the energetic protestation of our enlightened prelate, M. Depéry, the Bishop of Gap."

We learn from the same paper that a pretended discovery of a letter written in gold by the hands of the Saviour near Paris itself has been the subject of a *brochure* for the edification of remote provinces. And in this way France is to be converted to Christianity!

A remarkable letter written by Sir C. Eardley from Paris, and which has lately been published, contains some facts and observations which are amply deserving of notice. He says, addressing the Evangelical Alliance, "I think I cannot do better than communicate my anxieties and my suggestions to your conference, persuaded that all that are good, and generous, and soundly Protestant in the various Churches will accept the communication as made to themselves, and will act upon it as they may think most for the honour of our Lord and the good of his Church."

"The facts may be stated in two words—reaction against Protestantism in France and Popish action upon England. Persecution and

aggression. The most unblushing, the most universal, the most desperate persecution—a persecution in which the powers of Church and State are combined as for a last effort. And an aggression of which I am certain that neither the extent, nor the quarter from whence it comes, are adequately appreciated in our country.

“First, as to persecution. It would make this letter far too long to enter into details. One general fact is important to be noted—the attacks are more directed against the national Protestant Churches than against the Dissenters. Both are attacked; but account for it as you will, the preponderance of the assault is against the Established Lutheran and Reformed bodies. Perhaps the reason may be, that to a position which gives a certain authority in the country, they now add an amount of zeal and piety and aggressiveness which were not the case with them—so much as with Dissenters—a few years ago. Be that as it may, it has been consistorial congregations, consistorial schools, consistorial operations in general which have been mainly assaulted.

“I could tell you of churches closed by force by armed men without a shadow of right. I have in view a case where a humble evangelist had brought over to the Gospel a large proportion of the population of the commune. The mayor and municipal council made over, by a unanimous vote, a Romanist church which had become unnecessary to a new evangelical community. The Government of the republic has deprived the municipality of its functions, and the numerous congregation, continuing to meet as best it might, has been dissolved by force, reminding one of the dissolution of our Long Parliament by Cromwell's soldiers.

“I could tell you of prosperous and frequented schools stopped on the plea that Protestantism is an immoral, obscene, socialist system. I could name instances of the colportage of the Scriptures arbitrarily prohibited; the distribution not only of religious tracts but of the universally-circulated almanack “*Des Bons Conseils*,” entirely forbidden. An order to exhume the body of a Protestant Christian was positively given by the Minister of State, though it has not yet been acted upon; the local authorities had sanctioned the interment, but the Government ruled, at the instance of the Church, that the cemetery was desecrated by the presence of a Protestant coffin. All these are instances of persecution in connexion with consistories. Besides these, you have probably heard of the newspapers threatened with suspension for publishing the fact of the conversion of some Roman Catholics in Edinburgh. Our Welsh brethren have a mission in Brittany, the old British language of Wales being nearly identical. The circulation of their Breton tracts, and a journal commenced by them, are prohibited. The Wesleyan ministers in Paris have received orders to give up their worship, but have boldly disobeyed them.

“Besides these instances, to which the deputation will be able to subjoin many others, there is one most important case which happened *within* the present fortnight. You may be aware that the whole

public instruction of France is governed by the university, an institution founded by Napoleon on the broad principle of religious liberty. The university founds, or permits the establishment of primary schools for children under a certain age, and secondary schools, or colleges; besides the faculties, as they are called, of medicine, theology, letters (the *Literæ Humaniores* of Oxford), the sciences, &c. To supply these teaching institutions with teachers, Napoleon also founded one great normal school in Paris. Into that institution a limited number of pupil teachers is admitted periodically by competition, after a severe examination; ten times the number of young men who have passed the colleges competing for each vacancy. The list of those who intend to be competitors is previously laid before the Minister of State, to whom is assigned, by law, the function of removing from the list of candidates any individual whose moral character is not satisfactory. About a fortnight ago, M. Fortoul, minister of worship and of public instruction, erased from the list every Protestant and Israelite name of persons intending to be professors of letters, and afterwards stated to the Protestant authorities that it was the determination of the Government to limit the candidatureship of Jews and Protestants to persons intending to teach the sciences. The central Protestant consistories, the authorities of the established bodies, immediately met in Paris. For the first time since their creation the Lutheran and Reformed consistories met together. A deputation was sent to the minister. Without stating details, with which I am acquainted, I may say that the minister declared, '*Nous sommes intraitables.*' The Government was resolved to proceed. The consequences of such perseverance were modestly, but firmly, stated by Admiral Baudin on behalf of the Protestant confessions of France. The following day a Council of State was held at St. Cloud, when the President was present. A statesman who has lately entered the Government, and who has personal relations with both the Israelite and Protestant bodies, vehemently demanded the withdrawal of the measure. It was resolved to do so—for the time. Nearly all the Protestants are admitted. One, a young man of the highest possible character, M. Perrot, whose exclusion had been officially intimated to his college, has been readmitted to the competition, with circumstances which reflect serious blame on the Government, and the highest honour upon himself. This very day the great annual distribution of prizes of the university has taken place; and, as if Providence meant to mark the more the injustice of the attempt which has been defeated, the person among all the young men of all the colleges who obtained the highest prize, and whom M. Fortoul was obliged officially and publicly to embrace, was M. Perrot.

"Such are a few of the evils to which French Protestants are subjected; and I beg to assure you, whatever contrary opinion may have been entertained by some generally well-informed persons in London, there are no two opinions among the leading Protestants in Paris. All expect days of the fiercest persecution. It is not a

question of established Churches or of dissenting Churches, but a question of life and death for the Gospel of Christ in France.

"Mea res agitur paries quum proximus ardet. If the Jesuits were doing nothing but suppressing the truth in France, it would be a duty to our brethren, to ourselves, to Christ, to manifest our sympathy. But they are at the same time making gigantic efforts upon England. We talk of Papal aggression; of the multiplication of Romanist chapels, and priests, and Jesuits, and schools; of the perversions of many who have passed over to Rome, and the conversions of multitudes who would be more respectable if they did the same. We talk of these things as if they came from Rome. From Rome ecclesiastical they do come; but geographically they come from France. The Society for the Propagation of the Faith has its centre at Lyons. One-sixth, I am told, of the amount expended by that society for the Popish missions to the world is expended upon the British island. France, moreover, is organized from one end to the other in societies for the conversion of England. At the instance of the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer, aided by M. de Montalembert and other distinguished advocates of the Court of Rome, there is a wide-spread concert of prayer for the spiritual conquest of our country. Prayer, not made exclusively in the name of One Mediator, will not terrify us as regards its influence on the mind of God; but as regards the human aspect of the question, such a combination is at once a symptom and a means of fanatical confidence and zeal."

This letter of Sir C. Eardley's discloses exactly a state of things which might have been anticipated. Romanism is becoming every day more intolerant and more desperate in all parts of the continent of Europe; and its chief efforts are directed against England, as the bulwark of Protestantism. May those efforts be utterly in vain!

While Romanism is thus bent on the extermination of all who deny its authority, a violent controversy has arisen amongst its advocates on the question of the classics. We mentioned the commencement of this controversy in our last number.

A quarrel of the most acrimonious nature has for some time been going on between the "Univers" and the "Gazette de France" upon this subject. The "Gazette" had in the course of the dispute frequently charged the "Univers" with having received a written condemnation of its doctrines and polemics, signed by sixty-three bishops. After a good deal of subterfuge, the "Univers" was obliged to confess that M. l'Abbé Place, grand vicar of the Bishop of Orleans, had waited upon its chief editor by the desire of that prelate, and had communicated to him a declaration signed by forty-four bishops of France, testifying their approbation of the *mandement* put forth against the "Univers."

On the other hand, the "Univers" maintains its ground in defiance of the storm, encouraged by the sympathies of Cardinal Gousset and the Bishop of Arras, the latter of whom professes himself determined

to yield to nothing short of a papal rescript, which the former deems it worth while to deprecate. The Bishop of Arras, in a letter to the "Univers," comforts its chief editor under the severe castigation he has received, and upholds his opinions, though, of course, in very different language, and in a moderated form.

The Bishop of Gap has written a letter of rather an extraordinary kind, for a Christian prelate, to the Bishop of Orleans on the subject. The letter has been making the round of the provincial papers, and from its profane parody of the Creed, its authenticity was doubted. Its publication in the "Univers," and without remark, has, however, cleared up all doubts in this respect. It is as follows:—

"Monseigneur,—I believe in God, the Creator of the universe; but I do not believe in the good faith of those who wish to destroy the 'Univers' (the newspaper of that name).

"I believe in Jesus Christ, who has established his Church by means of Christian doctors, and not by the learned men of paganism.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost, who has spoken by the prophets, and not by the sybils.

"I believe in the Communion of Saints, but I do not desire to be of the communion of the 'Gazette,' the 'Siècle,' the 'Débats,' the 'Presse,' and the 'Charivari.'

"I believe in the resurrection of the dead, but I much fear that of the Gallicans and the Parliamentarians.

"I believe in eternal life, but I do not desire that of the Elysian fields, however beautiful they may be described by the pagan poets.

"That is to say, Monseigneur, that I am for the adoption of the Christian authors in a just proportion, without renouncing the masterpieces of Rome and of Athens, with all that is contrary to good morals and to the Catholic faith carefully expunged.

"I have the honour, &c.,

"IRENEE, Bishop of Gap."

On the other hand, the Bishop of Châtres has published a pamphlet with the motives of his adhesion to the late charge of the Bishop of Orleans respecting classical studies, and which, coming from such a source, may be considered as a serious blow to the ultramontane journal, the "Univers." After setting forth a sort of history of classical studies, and the part taken therein by the Church, showing that the present attack is nothing less than an accusation against the whole Church, and a supposition that her teaching has been erroneous through a long series of years, the bishop says;—

"The question agitated, therefore, immediately concerns religion; it contributes to her success and vast diffusion, or it diminishes the glory and extent of her victories. The indiscreet withdrawal, contrary to the received usages of the Church of all times, of a portion of the classical authors, is therefore no mere piece of inconsequential pedagogism, but a larceny against the truth, and an injury to a divine precept. . . . I adhere, therefore, entirely to the measure taken against the 'Univers' by the pious and learned Bishop of Orleans. . . ."

To this reprimand the "Univers" replied in a strain of the deepest submission, upon which the bishop wrote again, expressing his willingness to overlook the past. The "Univers," nevertheless, continued its controversy upon the classics; in consequence of which the Bishop of Châtres has addressed another letter to its editor, not directly, but through the "Ami de la Religion," with a request to publish it. The letter says the bishop had hoped the "Univers" would refrain from meddling with this discussion; that it was on that condition only he consented to renew his relations with the journal. "I now," he says, "send you back your paper, and you must no longer count me as your subscriber. Keep the rest of my subscriptions, or employ it in some good work. I shall also take measures that your journal no longer enters my seminaries. . . ."

In fact, it appears that the old question of Gallicanism and Ultramontaniam is at the bottom of this virulent and bitter controversy. This appears from the *mandement* of the Bishop of Châtres, in which he states his reasons for suspecting the "Univers" to be founded not merely on its condemnation of the classics, but its abuse of Gallicanism. He traces the conduct of the French clergy during the period of the old revolution, when out of 132 bishops, four only were found to take an oath of allegiance contrary to their conscience. Such, he says, was the fidelity of the "*Church of France*;" and, from what follows, the bishop appears to designate by that term what is commonly known as the Gallican Church, and the opinions peculiar to it. For he continues:—

"We respect these models, yet, what does the 'Univers' call us? 'Heretics; men separated from the Church;' and pursues us with its abuse and anathemas." And in a note he adds, "This is the constant language of the 'Univers,' which places us always in the same line with obstinate deserters of the Catholic Church. In its number of 23rd August, 1850, it places in the same rank *Arians, Protestants, Gallicans*. Now we generally denominate heretics as our *frères séparés*. Yet, in its number of the 8th May, 1852, the 'Univers' gives vent to its wish 'to be able to crush the remnant of the Gallican schism.' This word *Gallican* is a sort of fraudulent talisman, which seems to indicate the existence of a Church which is infamous and abominable amongst us. Yet what is it simply, in fact, but the name of the Church of France, which has produced so many great saints and great men for 1000 years, and which indicates the same orthodox immortal Church of which we are members; just as before Henry VIII. the Anglican Church meant the Church of England, and the German Church that of the different united portions of Germany. . . ."

GERMANY.—The following anecdote is told by the "Journal of Frankfort," in connexion with the Emperor's journey in Hungary:—"His Majesty having entered the palace of the Bishop of Gran, perceived the portrait of the celebrated Cardinal Puzman. The Emperor exclaimed, 'He also was a Jesuit; it is from the Jesuits that I princī-

pally expect the Catholic education of the youth of the country. That is why I re-established the order.' The Primate of Gran was agreeably surprised at hearing these words, for he for some time wished to establish a college of Jesuits at Tyman. He therefore requested the Emperor to permit him to bring two other Jesuits to that place. The Emperor replied, 'Two is not enough—the Jesuits must direct two or three schools, and they should undertake missions.' "

A pastoral letter of the Prince-Bishop of Lavant, in Carinthia, announces the establishment of a new confraternity for the conversion of schismatics, especially of the Slave nations, of which 22,349,000 are Roman Catholics, 54,000,000 belonging to the Greek Church, 1,531,000 Protestants, and nearly 800,000 Mahometans. Each member of the confraternity is to recite daily a *Pater* and *Ave*, with the invocation of St. Cyril and St. Methodius, and, if a priest, to say mass, if a layman, to confess and communicate, on March 3rd, the feast of those saints.

The Archbishop of Friburg, in the grand duchy of Baden, has condemned 140 priests to retire to convents for a given time, for having refused to execute certain orders given by him on the occasion of the death of the Grand Duke Leopold. This condemnation was, it appears, published in violation of some legal formalities, and the Government intends to proceed against the archbishop in consequence. On the other hand, most of the priests refuse to obey the prelate's orders, and it is not known what he will do against them.

The Supreme Ecclesiastical Council in Prussia has forbidden the Protestant clergy to admit Irvingites to the sacramental rites. A Protestant clergyman, consequently, refused to perform a marriage for a declared Irvingite there. The man applied for the interference of the civil court, which declared itself incompetent in matters of a purely clerical nature. The man has appealed to the supreme court.

A Catholic priest named Georgio Brindisi, from Greece, who has been collecting, or rather begging money, for the relief of oppressed Catholics in that country, has been ordered to quit Berlin immediately by the police.

The Right Rev. Dr. Gobat, Bishop of Jerusalem, lately preached in the English chapel at Berlin.

A student of theology at Bonn lately went in a fit of religious insanity to a neighbouring wood, with hammer and nails, and, finding a tree in the form of a cross, actually crucified himself. He was found in a state of insensibility by some peasants, who, not having tools for drawing the nails, felled the tree, and carried him with it to the next village. The young man is now in the hospital at Bonn, and out of danger.

The Paris "Univers" has attacked the Prussian minister of public worship, M. Von Raumer, for restricting the attendance of Prussian students at the Jesuits' college at Rome, and other measures not approved by the ultramontane clergy.

It appears, in fact, that Prussia is assuming a position more consistent with its character of a leading Protestant power on the Continent.

It has suppressed several Jesuit seminaries lately ; and it has interfered on behalf of the persecuted Protestants in Italy.

The Government of Hanover has issued an order forbidding all meetings of Anabaptists, and threatening with imprisonment any foreign missionary of that sect who shall attempt to preach in the Hanoverian territory. Some Anabaptist missionaries from Bremen have been expelled from the principality of Waldeck.

GREECE.—For some time past the Government of Athens have been much troubled by a rebellious monk, one Father Christopheros, who succeeded in raising whole provinces of the kingdom in revolt on the pretext that the Government is undermining the pure Greek church. It is against the arrangement recently concluded by King Otho with the patriarch acknowledging a modified authority in religious matters on his part, that the monk Christopheros has taken the field, from which the Government finds it so difficult to drive him. To such extremes had he proceeded, that he issued a proclamation to the following effect :—

“Whoever kills one of the king’s soldiers is a saint ; whoever is killed himself in battle is a martyr ; whoever can kill one of the king’s soldiers, and refrains from doing so, will go to hell ; whoever takes part in this holy war shall keep all the booty he can lay hands on ; whoever distinguishes himself shall receive one hundred dollars, besides military rank and honours.”

It appears that the false miracles by which Christopheros pretends to attest his divine mission are hardly less ingenious than the military tactics by which he eluded or repelled, for several weeks, the forces sent to capture him. He has at length, however, been obliged to succumb, for a letter from Athens, in a Vienna journal, says :—

“The monk Christopheros has been arrested in the Maina by the gendarmes, and has arrived at the Piræus on board the “Othon” steamer. After having been subjected to an interrogatory before the Juge d’Instruction and the Procurer-General, he was taken to the state prison. Two Mainotes, one a priest and the other a laic, agreed to deliver him up for ten thousand drachmas. He is to be removed to the fortress of Rhion, in the Gulf of Lepanto.”

The Rev. Mr. King, an American missionary at Athens, has been thrown into prison by the Government of Greece on the charge of proselytizing. The Government of the United States having repeatedly demanded his liberation, but to no purpose, a squadron, consisting of two frigates and two war steamers, has been dispatched to Greece, for the purpose of liberating the missionary ; and has arrived at its destination.

ITALY.—The following works have recently been condemned at Rome by the Inquisition and the Congregation of the Index :—“Carta al Papa, e analisis del Breve 10 Junio, 1851,” by Francisco de Paula G. Vigil. “Studi sull apostolica sicola Lagazia,” del Professore Vin-

cenzo Crisafulli. Decr. 1 Jul. 1852—"History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century," by J. H. Merle-d'Aubigné. Decr. eod—"Del Papato, Studi Storici," di Filippo de' Boni. Decr. eod—"Dictionnaire Universel d'Histoire et de Géographie, contenant: (1) l'Histoire proprement dite; (2) la Biographie Universelle; (3) la Mythologie; (4) la Géographie ancienne et moderne," par M. N. Bouillet, Paris, 1851. With the former editions. Decr. eod—"Il Gerofilo Siciliano." "Gironale di Religione e Sacra letteratura." Decr. eod.

Several persons suspected of carrying on a political correspondence with Paris have been arrested at Rome, in consequence of information received from the French police department.

Correspondence from Rome announces the discovery of a magnificent bath of Oriental alabaster, by workmen employed in repairing the water-courses of that city. It has been found on the Piazza of the Holy Apostles, in the immediate vicinity of Trajan's Forum. Unfortunately, it has been somewhat damaged by previous workmen, who appear to have broken a hole through the alabaster side, in order to pass a water conduit through it.

The "Univers" states that the miraculous movement of the eyes of the picture of "the Mother of Mercy" at Rimini still continues, not incessantly, but at frequent intervals. The eyes are turned towards heaven, their movement, slow and gentle, is from right to left, but from time to time they lower themselves; then, at intervals, the look is animated in an ineffable manner!

A royal decree entrusts the Lyceum of Salerno to the Jesuits.

An English Protestant, who kept a school at Naples, has been compelled by order of the cardinal archbishop to close his establishment, on the ground that he cannot be permitted publicly to teach doctrines which the Neapolitans believe to be bad.

We have the following account of the circumstances in correspondence from Naples, published in the journals:—

"Mr. Hamilton is an English Protestant schoolmaster, who settled in Naples early in 1848, and opened a Protestant school for the instruction of English and Swiss boys. His establishment rapidly increased, and, therefore, attracted the jealousy of the Neapolitan ecclesiastical authorities. Not being able to treat Mr. Hamilton as they had treated the Swiss, he became the object of indirect annoyance. The police visited the parents of his pupils, and endeavoured to influence such as had any connexion with or dependence on Government employment. Some were induced to withdraw their children under fear of the parent losing his appointment (engineer, for example) in Naples. Other Protestant parents, having less protection than British subjects, were equally intimidated; and by such means Mr. Hamilton's establishment was reduced to some dozen children of purely English parents. Such was the state of things when Mr. Hamilton, a few days since, was called before the police, and told to shut up his school; that the Government could no longer allow a Protestant school to exist in Naples. Mr.

Hamilton replied, that he carried on his business of schoolmaster by right of treaty; that he had never offended the law, and would not therefore comply with the unjust demand of closing his school. Soon after this interview, the police suddenly entered the house of Mr. Hamilton, and turned out all the boys by force, some of whom, their parents not being in Naples, were positively in the streets, not knowing where to go. This unjustifiable act was immediately communicated to Sir W. Temple, who no doubt has taken immediate steps to protect Mr. Hamilton. It is a subject on which the Home Government ought to express their opinion, if British subjects are to be allowed to reside in Naples as traders or visitors."

The Jesuits have been publicly installed by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities at S. Giovanni di Verdara, in Padua.

The Piedmontese Legislature having passed a law establishing a civil ceremony of marriage, formed on the French Marriage Law, the Church of Rome is vehemently opposing it. A protest threatening ecclesiastical censures has been presented by the bishops.

The address of the archbishops and bishops of the kingdom, to the Piedmontese Senate, against the Civil Marriage Bill, cannot be taken into consideration by the senate, not having been written in the form of a petition. The first signature to the document is that of Monsignor Franzoni, the exiled Archbishop of Turin.

The Archbishop of Chambery and the Bishops of Aoste, Tarantaise, Maurienne, and Annecy followed the example of their Piedmontese colleagues, by publishing a declaration, in which, after proclaiming the Marriage Act to be unconstitutional, immoral, anti-social, and anti-Catholic, they declare that any Catholic in their diocese who should presume to marry according to a form different from that prescribed by the Church shall, *ipso facto*, incur excommunication. He will be deprived of the sacraments during life, and in the hour of death, unless he has canonically rehabilitated his marriage, or dismissed the person whom the Church can only regard as his concubine. Should he die without conforming to those prescriptions, he shall be deprived of Christian burial, and his children, in a canonical point of view, shall be considered illegitimate.

Cardinal Antonelli has addressed a letter to the Bishop of Chambery, approving the protests of the Savoyan clergy, against the law on civil matrimony.

Active steps are being taken against Protestant proselytism, which has of late made signal progress in Tuscany.

Thousands are ready to secede from the faith of their fathers, if the public declaration of such a change were not attended with dangerous consequences. The celebrated Leopoldine laws stand in the way of the ultra-clerical party, who are very powerful in Tuscany, and are eager to crush the march of Protestant proselytism. The eyes of all Florence have of late been directed to the trial of the Madias, man and wife, who have, after a prolonged and unjust imprisonment, been sen-

tenced to fifty-six and forty-five months' imprisonment, though the evidence brought against them was of the most unconclusive character, and public opinion concurs in absolving them.

The Court of Cassation at Florence has confirmed the sentence of the inferior court by which Madiari is condemned to fifty-six months, and his wife to forty-five months, of hard labour at the galleys, and all the costs of the trial, for the "crime" of having abandoned the communion of the Romish Church, and, according to the literal terms of the sentence, "following the pure Gospel" (*puro Evangelo*).

The ceremony of crowning the picture of the Madonna, under the title of the Santissima Annunziata, took place Sept. 8, at Florence, amidst an immense concourse of people.

In a tract just published, wherein a vast number of most astounding miracles are circumstantially related as having been worked by the picture in question, it is stated that the face of the Holy Virgin as it now appears on the wall of the chapel, was supernaturally depicted by a celestial hand, whilst the painter at work on the fresco was asleep, in the year 1252.

SCANDINAVIA.—The Danish and Norwegian Churches have, at their recent meetings, discussed the proposed introduction of a new Psalm Book. They feel disposed to vindicate their synodal rights.

The Archbishop of Upsala is about to hold a voluntary, unofficial synod of the clergy of his diocese—another indication that the Swedish Church is awaking from its long slumber.

A meeting of clergy and laity of the Swedish Church, at which some Danish clergy were also present, has been held at Helsingborg, under the leadership of Rector Hammar, editor of the "Evangelical Church Friend." The tendencies of the movement are of a Presbyterian character, and in harmony with the views of the London Evangelical Alliance; and it is likely to become popular.

On the other hand, the "Kirketidende," the Danish Church Gazette, contains a letter from a Danish pastor, named Hass, who states that he has, through an English clergyman, entered into correspondence with the Episcopal Church respecting the conditions required for receiving from it episcopal ordination. "I have" (he says) "always considered the true apostolic ordination as *a great blessing*, which, if not *absolutely* necessary, were exceedingly to be desired, and most profitable, as well in a Church communion entirely free from connexion with the powers of the State, and, therefore, from the fear of worldly force and oppression, as in the case of their union; for I conceived that it would mightily contribute to clear the relations between Church and State, where they should continue on good grounds to be united, so that the Church should allow the State to hold what is its own—full and unlimited authority over all worldly matters—and the State, on its part, abstain from interference (judicial or otherwise) with the Church's sacred things, great and small.

"As, moreover, at the same time, it was likewise evident to me that

either Christians in this country must separate from the National Church, should it again become a State Church or State engine (for the new would manifestly be far worse than the old), or the relations must be so ordered that Christianity might operate with the necessary freedom, unhindered by the civil law and the heathens of the land, I considered that, happen what might, a connexion with the greatest and most powerful Protestant Church communion would be of most signal importance, provided the bond of union might be the true ordination, and the ground of the union 'the universal Christian faith.'

"From hence it is evident that it was not merely for myself individually I desired such a connexion, but for the whole Protestant Lutheran Church community, which, as is well known, is in a very confused and miserable state. However, some one must make an advance towards such a union—some one must begin—nothing comes of this eternal talking without any practical intent.

"A correspondence has accordingly been opened, and has advanced so far that I believe I may give the assurance that both I and every true Lutheran priest in this country can receive the true ordination from a 'free Episcopal Church,' without being required to give any promise that can clash with our convictions as Lutherans, either in respect of doctrine or the administration of the sacraments."

ASIA.

Ceylon.—The foundation-stone of the chapel of St. Thomas's College, a building to be used hereafter as the cathedral of the diocese, was laid on Tuesday, 15th June, by the Bishop of Colombo. At five o'clock the Evening Service was performed, as usual, in the spacious school-room, which, however, was far too small to hold the congregation, a large number being obliged to remain in the verandah. The procession having reached the spot laid out for the foundation of the future chapel, around which were grouped the congregation which had attended the service at the collegiate school-room, and many more well-dressed natives of both sexes, the ceremony commenced. For this there was an appropriate service, the greater part of which was chanted.

After prayer, the bishop addressed the assembled multitude.

The following are extracts from a recent letter of the Bishop of Colombo to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, from a place called Gampola:—

"The good spirit manifested in the erection of the little church at this place deserves a special record, as being the fruit chiefly of Singhalese exertion. The resident magistrate, a Singhalese gentleman of high family, has been not less earnest and judicious than prompt in the execution of the good work. At Christmas the foundation was only just laid, and Easter has hardly passed when I am called to consecrate the completed structure. This has just been done, and I gladly anticipated on the occasion the small grant promised to them on the part of your Society by myself on a former occasion. I have still to add to

our debt of thankfulness, by the request for a 4to. set of books for the performance of Divine Service.

“The consecration was very pleasing. The little church was quite full. Almost all the Europeans settled on the coffee plantations within ten or twelve miles, and many of the humble native Christians, were present. I was assisted by the Rev. W. H. Simons, the chaplain of the district.

“The church of Gampola is a small but solid brick building, with tiled roof. With its chancel and porch, bell-turret, and pointed windows, in a green and woody knoll, amid such beautiful mountain scenery, and in the midst of a Moorish and heathen population of about 1500, it seems, if not to consecrate the broad and expanding valley which it adorns, at least to show that the Cross and its blessed truths are within the reach of all, and that the spiritually blind and halt and poor ‘have the Gospel preached to them.’

“After the completion of the service, in which the offertory, with the aid of your kind grant, enabled the committee to discharge all expenses incurred for the fittings, &c., I received from a native Christian of humble rank, the sealed grant and deed of gift, legally transferred to me, of a burial-ground for the church, which he was anxious to present to me on that day. Nor was the solemnity without a still more pleasing accompaniment in the expression of the whole body of native Christians of humbler rank, that I would endeavour to station among them a catechist who might minister regularly to them, as far as a layman can, in their own language. Such was the substance of the memorial presented to me; nor am I without hope of being able to effect the very desirable object, by the aid of small monthly contributions in the neighbourhood.”

MAURITIUS.—Arrangements have been made for the formation of a bishopric in the Mauritius, towards the foundation of which the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts has contributed 3000*l*.

The Belle-Isle mission, in the Mauritius, is progressing most satisfactorily, with one vigorous offshoot already in full work, with its schools at Vacoas, and a congregation of 400; and another just about to be established at Petite Rivière.

The “Port Louis Overland Commercial Gazette” gives an encouraging account of missionary operations in the Mauritius. The mission at Bambou, which in August last year possessed a congregation of forty, and a school of thirty attendants, had in January this year a congregation of 450, and a school of forty. Another congregation has been assembled at Petite Rivière; and much more might be done if money and clergymen were supplied. What has already been accomplished is mainly owing to the operation of the Mauritius Church Association, and the pastoral exertions of the Rev. G. de Joux, the Professor of Mathematics at the Royal College.

The "Colonial Church Chronicle" for July contains an interesting paper upon the state of the Church at Seychelles, by the Rev. F. G. de la Fontaine, Missionary of the S. P. G. F. P. The population of the group is about 7000, of whom much more than 3000 are unchristianized. The Church, however, is making way; and in 1851 the number of baptisms had increased to 252, from 133 in the previous year. It is to be hoped that these small islets, as well as other places in the vicinity, will be placed under the superintendence of the proposed new Bishop of Mauritius, and that his attention will be earnestly turned to their spiritual wants.

AFRICA.

It is stated that the Bishop of London has resolved to terminate the division at Madeira, by licensing the Rev. T. K. Brown to the chaplaincy at that place.

The new Bishop of Sierra Leone has embarked for his diocese.

The Lord Bishop of Cape Town has left his diocese with a view to bring before the authorities in England its urgent necessities. A letter from the bishop to one of our principal societies will explain his objects:—

"I propose to include the erection of a see at Natal amongst the objects which I must endeavour to accomplish during my present visit to England. The claims of that rising colony to separate spiritual government are easily stated. It is as large as Scotland; has a heathen population of 151,000 souls, for whose conversion little has yet been done; and a rapidly increasing European population. It is distant a thousand miles by sea from Cape Town; and I travelled nearly fourteen hundred miles before I reached it by land. Hitherto the communication with Cape Town has been very irregular and uncertain. I think that I receive replies to my letters from England more rapidly than from Natal.

"Should I succeed in establishing the Zulu missions, which form one of the chief objects I have at present in view, it will be absolutely necessary that I should reside for a considerable portion of the year in that extreme part of the diocese. I may add that the Wesleyans have already three superintendents in South Africa, where we have as yet but one bishop; and that the Romanists have two bishops, and intend, I understand, to send a vicar apostolic to Natal. Trusting that it may please God to dispose the hearts of some of the wealthier members of our communion to provide the funds needful for the completion of this good work, I remain," &c.

AMERICA.

CANADA.—The Radical party in Canada have been extremely disappointed by the refusal of the English Government to introduce a measure for confiscating the clergy reserves in Canada.

Previous to the departure of the Venerable A. N. Bethune, D.D.,

Archdeacon of York, for England, whither he has proceeded on a mission on behalf of the funds of Trinity College, Toronto, addresses were presented to him from the congregation of St. Peter's Church, Cobourg, in which he officiates, and from the pupils of the church school at Cobourg, expressive of the deepest admiration of his services, and of affection for his person. The archdeacon returned feeling and instructive replies.

NEWFOUNDLAND.—The Bishop of Newfoundland is endeavouring to promote the erection of a diocesan seminary.

The "Canadian" announces the creation of the Three Rivers district in the Popish diocese of Quebec into a separate diocese by a Papal decree. The Popish "province of Quebec," therefore, now consists of seven dioceses,—Quebec, Three Rivers, Montreal, Bytown, Kingston, Toronto, and Red River, or the North-West diocese.

UNITED STATES.—The new diocese of Texas, at its third annual convention, proceeded to the election of a bishop, when Dr. Freeman was unanimously elected. The bishop elect asked for time to consider the question of his acceptance of the office.

The "New York Churchman" announces the death of the Right Rev. Christopher Edwards Gadsden, D.D., Bishop of South Carolina. The event was not unexpected, the bishop having long been in a precarious state of health. The "Churchman" adds:—

"Bishop Gadsden was a native of Charleston, and a grandson of General Christopher Gadsden, a distinguished worthy of the revolution. He was a graduate of Yale College, and received his academic honours in the same class with Mr. Calhoun. He was ordained deacon July 25, 1807, by Bishop Moore, of New York, and priest in April, 1810, by Bishop Madison, of Virginia. In January, 1808, he was elected Rector of Biggin Church, in the parish of St. John's, Berkley, and resigned on the 2nd February, 1810, to enter on the duties of Assistant Minister of St. Philip's Church, in Charleston, to which office he was chosen on the 21st December, 1809. On the 17th July, 1814, he was chosen Rector of St. Philip's, as the successor of the Rev. James Dewar Simons, and continued to officiate there to the time of his death. In 1840, he was elected Bishop of the diocese of South Carolina, as the successor of the Right Rev. Nathaniel Bowen, D.D., and was consecrated in Trinity Church, Boston, on Sunday, June 21st, 1840. Bishop Gadsden was an eminent prelate of his Church, equally distinguished for deep learning, elegance of composition, and fervent piety."

Bishop Henshaw's death is of later date. The event occurred on the 20th ult., near Frederick, Maryland. He has just completed his sixtieth year, more than forty of which were faithfully spent in the service of the Church. He was consecrated to the Episcopate of Rhode Island, in 1843. The "New York Churchman" says,—“The bishop has just commenced a brief visitation of the diocese of Mary-

land, at the request of Bishop Whittingham, which renders this melancholy dispensation more severe."

At the convention of the diocese of Maryland, on the 26th May, Bishop Whittingham, on account of ill health, proposed to resign, or accept the services of an assistant bishop. The committee reported expressions of regret, and advised a long sea voyage, authorizing him to select some of his brother bishops to attend to his episcopal duties—the whole of the expenses to be paid out of the episcopal fund. The report was adopted. The committee, to whom the subject of the correspondence between the bishop and Dr. Johns (condemning the latter for preaching in a Methodist pulpit, and his persisting in so doing) was referred, approved strongly of the bishop's condemnation of the act; but, on account of the motives of the reverend gentleman, and the same thing having been done before, advised that no ecclesiastical proceedings be had in the case.

It is alleged that among the Jews in the United States—supposed to amount to nearly 100,000—there are hundreds who believe that Jesus is the Messiah, but do not possess the moral courage to avow their conviction.

A general conference of the "Latter-day Saints" was held at the dedication of the New Tabernacle, Great Salt Lake City, in April last, Brigham Young presiding. The report of the proceedings states, that "Brigham Young was sustained, by the unanimous vote of the conference, as the president, prophet, seer, and revelator of the Church of Latter-day Saints in all the earth; and Heber C. Kimball, and William Richards, as his councillors." The receipts of "the Church," from "the commencement of tithing," in the valley, in 1848, have been 390,260 dollars. Ninety-three brethren volunteered to go with horses and wagons and meet the saints who were walking over the prairie. Missionaries were appointed to Italy, Calcutta, and other foreign countries. Edward Hunter was ordained "presiding bishop of the whole Church," with five assistant bishops. A few were "disfellowshipped," and sixty-seven ordained priests. The conference issued their seventh "general epistle to the saints throughout the earth," which, after a flourishing account of their temporal prosperity, concludes with general exhortations.

AUSTRALASIA.

POLYNESIA.—A marvellous escape from murder of the Bishops of New Zealand and of Newcastle was mentioned lately at the meeting of the S.P.G.F.P.:—"The two prelates were on a visit to one of the Polynesian islands, when they were set upon by the natives, and, becoming separated, were in the greatest possible danger. They and their crews were surrounded by natives, who were full of ferocity, but were eventually subdued by moral resolution rather than by physical strength. The Bishop of Newcastle had stated that he had never experienced, during the course of his life, two hours of such extreme mental agony."

NEW ZEALAND.—At a meeting held in the diocese of New Zealand, and presided over by the bishop, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

That it is extremely desirable that some form of constitution for the government of the branch of the Church of England in New Zealand should be established with as little delay as possible.

That all adult members of the Church of England resident in the district be invited to enrol themselves as such, and agree to pay a subscription of 3s. per quarter for Church purposes.

That the adult members of the Church of England so enrolling their names, shall annually appoint a committee from their own members, to determine to what specific purposes connected with the Church, and in what proportions the funds they subscribe shall be applied.

That such committee shall be authorized to receive subscriptions for Church purposes from any persons wishing to subscribe, either generally for Church purposes, or for some specific object connected with the welfare of the Church of England.

That a committee shall be appointed by such enrolled members of the Church of England to prepare petitions to both Houses of Parliament, praying that any laws which may be deemed necessary or proper for the purpose of enrolling the members of the Church of England to manage their own internal affairs in the New Zealand islands, may be enacted by Parliament.

TASMANIA.—It appears from the "Tasmania Church Chronicle," that through the mutual good will and forbearance of the bishop and clergy, the controversy which recently agitated that diocese is in a fair way to be adjusted.

The "Tasmanian Church Chronicle" reports a meeting of the clergy of that diocese, under the presidency of the bishop, convened in consequence of the minute of the Australian bishops. The circular calling the meeting enclosed the following extract from a letter by the Archbishop of Canterbury:—

" Lambeth, 4th July, 1851.

" With respect to the matter of greater doubt and difficulty, the inconvenience is apparent of the uncertain jurisdiction of the bishops, and the consequent imperfection of discipline, in your remote provinces. For the present the Queen's supremacy must be assumed as unquestionable; and no doubt it prevents the issuing of the synodical mandate, or even the assembling of any synod which should claim authority.

" Whenever the subject of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the colonies has been mooted here, the absence of any specific scheme or proposal on the part of the colonial bishops has been urged as a reason for postponing the consideration; and it certainly would not be competent for the authorities here to propose such enactments as might remedy the

evils under which you labour, without a suggestion from you of the means of their removal. It appears to me that such a scheme as might be drawn up on the spot, with especial view to the inconveniences which you experience in the practical enforcement of discipline, should be prepared and sent to this country.

"The subject would then be considered by the colonial secretary and the ecclesiastical officers of the Crown, and such legislation might follow as would place you in a better condition for the right administration of Church discipline.—I remain, &c.

"J. B. CANTUAR."

The meeting was attended by thirty-five clergymen, assembled from all parts of the island, some had travelled 150 miles to be present. The bishop having opened the meeting with prayer, and an address, it was proposed to adjourn till after the Sydney meeting, but, on the motion being put, there were only four supporters, and it was consequently lost. The bishop then called the attention of the meeting to the question—how might the opinion of the laity, upon the matter thus decided by the clergy, be best obtained?

His lordship adverted to various difficulties of detail that would arise, such as (in the event of a conference being called) the qualifications of the persons who should elect delegates to it, &c.; but stated that upon one point his own mind was clear—that the clergy, thus solemnly met together, were bound to show to the communicants of the Church, that they considered them as pre-eminently the laity. After a discussion, in which several speakers expressed their hearty acceptance of this opinion, and various methods were suggested for collecting the sentiments of the laity, it was proposed and carried, with no dissentients,—“That a committee, consisting of the Ven. the Archdeacon of Hobart Town, with the clergy resident within the district of Hobart, be appointed for the purpose of considering by what plan the opinions of the lay communicants of the Church may be best obtained upon the matters brought before the clergy to-day; the said committee to invite suggestions upon the subject, and to report to the bishop.”

A diocesan board of missions has been instituted in Hobart Town for the diocese of Tasmania, in connexion with the general Australasian board.

SYDNEY.—Synodal Action.—The Bishop of Sydney convened the clergy of his diocese at Sydney on the 14th of April last, to consider the declaration agreed to at the meeting of the metropolitan and suffragan bishops of the province of Australasia, held at Sydney in 1850, asserting the necessity of provincial and diocesan synods, and provincial and diocesan conventions of the laity to be held simultaneously with the synods, for the settlement of many questions of great importance to the well-being of the Church in the province. Twenty-nine of the clergy appeared in person, and twenty by proxy, in accordance with an arrangement made by the bishop for the convenience of the

clergy. After a luminous address from the bishop on the various questions involved in the synodal action of the Church, the following resolution was carried by a majority of 30 to 19 :—

“The clergy of the diocese of Sydney having given their best consideration to the important question proposed to them by their diocesan—recommend that, in any constitution adopted for the better regulation of the affairs of the Church, the clergy, and the representatives of the laity should meet and deliberate together, reserving to each order the right of discussing any question that may come before them, and that the concurrence of both orders should be necessary to give validity to any act.”

A petition to the Queen was also adopted by a majority of 35 to 8, which is as follows :—

“To Her Most Gracious Majesty Victoria, by the Grace of God of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland Queen, Defender of the Faith,

“The humble petition of the undersigned, the Bishop of Sydney, clergy, and lay members of the Church of England within the diocese aforesaid,

“Showeth,—That the ecclesiastical laws of England, not being wholly applicable to the Church of England in this diocese, your petitioners labour under several grave disadvantages.

“That in consequence of the present position of your petitioners in this respect, it is found impossible that proper discipline should be exercised over the clergy and laity, without the appearance of harsh and arbitrary power on the part of the bishop of the diocese.

“That, besides this serious disadvantage, the Church is much impeded in her legitimate efforts to extend the faith of Christ, and the means of grace, in this extensive diocese, in proportion to the rapidly increasing population of the country.

“That in the opinion of your Majesty's petitioners it would tend for the honour of Almighty God, the good and quiet of his Church, and the better government thereof, that there should be synods of the bishop and clergy periodically assembled within this diocese ; and also that the laity, acting by representatives duly elected by the congregations of the several churches, should meet in conventions in connexion with the synod of the bishops and clergy ; and that the bishop, clergy, and laity, being thus assembled, should be qualified and authorized to debate and consult, under proper regulations, for the better ordering of the affairs of the United Church of England and Ireland within this diocese ; and to frame and enact proper rules, regulations, and canons, not being contrary to any law of Church or State, for the due ordering of the affairs of the said Church, maintaining nevertheless as heretofore its integral union and connexion with the Established Church of England and Ireland.

“That doubts are entertained whether the supremacy of your Majesty, as under God the only governor of this realm in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things or causes, having been expressly admitted by

all bishops and clergy when consecrated or ordained to their respective offices in the ministry, may not prohibit their assembling, as is desired, in a diocesan synod.

“That the practice of assembling conventions of laymen, elected in the manner herein proposed, to take part in the management of ecclesiastical affairs, has not been heretofore recognized, or appointed by law, or any known custom of the Church of England.

“That your petitioners therefore submit with deference to your Majesty’s royal consideration the expediency of removing the obstacles which at this time appear to oppose the execution of the design which they have presumed to lay before your Majesty, of better providing for the security, and for the more extended usefulness of that Church which, during many centuries, has flourished under the auspices of your Majesty’s royal predecessors.

“And your Majesty’s humble petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.”

It is stated that the Bishop of Sydney is on his way to England in prosecution of the measures taken for the establishment of synodal action in the Australian province.

An Australian paper mentions that the Bishop of Sydney preached lately at the township of Sofala, in aid of the erection of a Church there, and that many of the miners attended, several making offerings in the shape of small nuggets of gold.

ADELAIDE.—On the feast of the Epiphany, the 6th of January last, and the two following days, the Bishop of Adelaide held a “synod or convention,” or, as it is also called in the documents, “a conference” of the bishop, clergy, and laity of his diocese. There were present on the occasion sixteen representatives of the diocesan clergy, and eighteen lay-deputies, elected by their respective parishes. In the opening address the bishop made some interesting observations on the revival of the synodal functions of the Church in England, and on the relation of the colonial dioceses to the mother Church:—

The following are the principal resolutions adopted by the Convention:—

“Whereas the Church of England in South Australia receives no aid from the local governments by grants of land or money; but is dependent solely on the voluntary contribution of its members for the support of its ministry; the maintenance of missions to the aborigines and other heathen; and for building of churches, parsonages, and schools, in which its doctrine and discipline may be taught. And whereas for the edification of its members, and ‘provoking to love’ and the above-mentioned ‘good works,’ it is desirable that they should be brought into closer fellowship by parochial organization, and ‘the assembling of themselves together’ periodically—we, the bishop, clergy, and laity in conference assembled, have agreed to recommend the following plans and suggestions to the several congregations of this colony.

“And whereas this Diocesan Church is part and parcel of the united Church of England and Ireland, by law established in the United Kingdom; and therefore subject to the general ecclesiastical laws enforcing the supremacy of the Crown, the use of the Book of Common Prayer, the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures, and subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles:—We, the bishop, clergy, and laity being under the obligations thus implied, and being earnestly desirous to maintain inviolate that unity and fellowship in the Church of our fathers, do declare that we hold it to be incompetent for any diocesan assembly, or synod of the clergy, or convention of lay representatives, held in pursuance of these recommendations, to ‘treat, debate, consider, consult, or agree upon,’ any alteration in those formularies and principles, except it be initiated by the direct authority of the Crown, or in virtue of license from the Crown obtained in that behalf.

“Under this limitation, with the view of promoting the closer fellowship as well as efficiency of this Diocesan Church, we have resolved to recommend that an assembly consisting of the bishop, chapter of clergy, and convention of lay representatives be convened periodically, composed as is hereinafter specified, and to be called the ‘diocesan assembly.’

“I. *Diocesan Assembly*.—This assembly is constituted when the convention and chapter of clergy meet together and are presided over by the bishop.

“II. *Chapter of Clergy*.—The chapter of clergy consists of every duly licensed officiating minister, presbyters alone having the right of voting.

“III. *Convention of Laity*.—The convention shall consist of lay representatives (being communicants) for all the congregations, in the following proportion:—for a congregation of 100 souls, one representative; 100 and under 200, two representatives; and so on in proportion, to be elected annually in the month of October by the registered lay members of each congregation contributing to its seat-rent or the pastoral-aid fund, and attending from time to time on the worship of the Church.

“Instruction.—Under the present circumstances of the Church in this diocese, we are of opinion that persons who communicate three times in the year are eligible to be elected lay representatives.

“IV. *Election of Representatives*.—A meeting of adult male registered lay members qualified to vote according to Class III. shall be called for the purpose of electing representatives, by the minister, or in his absence or default by the wardens, by a notice posted on the church doors at least seven clear days previous to the day of meeting. Each adult shall have a vote for each sitting, provided that no person shall have more than six votes. No person shall vote in respect of any sitting the rent of which shall be then due and unpaid. The votes shall be in writing, to be openly declared, personal attendance not being necessary. In the event of any person elected as representative

declining, or being unable to act, the next highest on the list shall be declared duly elected. In the event of an equality of votes, the chairman shall have a casting vote. A return of the representatives elected shall be made by the chairman, who shall be the minister, or in his absence such person as the meeting may elect, to the bishop of the diocese within fourteen days. The presence of at least five members of the congregation, besides the chairman, shall be necessary to constitute a meeting for the election of representatives. The wardens, if in attendance, shall act as scrutineers.

"V. Meeting of Assembly.—The diocesan assembly shall be convened annually by the bishop in the month of December, on which occasion Divine Service shall be held, and a pastoral letter from the bishop containing a report of the general state of the Church in this diocese—the progress of religion and education—and of the means of public worship, will be received. Extraordinary meetings may be convened by the bishop, when he sees fit, or upon a requisition by seven of the clergy who have been at least five years in priests' orders, or of ten representatives.

"VI. Mode of Deliberation.—It shall be lawful for the chapter of clergy and convention to deliberate apart, or in conference (by mutual agreement) with each other, or with the bishop.

"VII. Mode of Voting.—The assent or dissent of the chapter of clergy and convention shall be determined by the majority of open votes in each order respectively. No resolution shall be passed, unless one-third of each order shall be present.

"VIII. No rule shall be binding on the members of the Church in this diocese, which shall not have received the concurrent assent of the bishop, the chapter of clergy, and the convention in the diocesan assembly.

"IX. Committees.—The diocesan assembly shall, at every annual meeting, appoint a standing committee for the ensuing year, consisting of seven clerical and fourteen lay members, the bishop of the diocese to be the president. Two clerical and four lay members shall form a quorum. This committee shall elect its finance and other sub-committees, and transact the business assigned to it by the diocesan assembly during its recess, subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by that assembly.

"X. Finance.—The establishment of five separate and distinct funds is recommended, viz.:—a pastoral-aid fund, which we consider to be of primary importance, an endowment fund, a church-building fund, an educational fund, and a mission fund to the aborigines and heathen. These funds shall be placed under the control and be subject to the regulation of the diocesan assembly, and be administered by its finance committee."

THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1853.

ART. I.—*Hippolytus and his Age; or, the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus: and ancient and modern Christianity compared.* By CHRISTIAN CHARLES JOSIAS BUNSEN, D.C.L. In 4 volumes. London: Longmans.

THE learned and ingenious author of this work is well known to the English literary and religious world, from his intimate connexion with the late Dr. Arnold, who may almost be regarded as a disciple of the Chevalier Bunsen; and also by means of his various publications, amongst which the “Church of the Future” and the “Letters on Ignatius” hold a conspicuous place.

The eminent and influential position held for a long series of years by the Chevalier Bunsen, combined with the high attainments and abilities of which his writings afford abundant proof, have, without doubt, contributed largely to the spread of opinions amongst some portion of the higher classes in this country, which we, at least, should deprecate, as tending to introduce a class of speculations dangerous to the stability of religious belief,—in fact those which include the characteristic merits and faults of the German theologians. The Chevalier is one of those persons who are enthusiastic in their admiration of every thing German; and who are unable to tolerate the bigotry and folly, as they call it, of those amongst ourselves who do not admire Deism or Pantheism, when transmitted to us through the medium of German theology, even though Deism should perchance have taken its origin a century and a half ago in this country. The Chevalier and his friends have been labouring for many years to create a taste for German theology; and they have not been altogether unsuccessful: they may not have been desirous of promoting a taste for Rationalism; but they have, we believe, contributed materially to that result. The Chevalier is a Christian, and holds many parts of the Christian faith; but he is one of those who is always scoffing at “Bibliolatry,” or the usual notions of inspiration; and who would sweep away Creeds and Articles of faith, and very many of our principles, as mere rubbish; and would create a new Church and new religious system for the nineteenth century, founded on a system of speculation and criticism, which would set aside, without scruple, the ideas of

eighteen hundred years. Opposed as he is to many of the conclusions, and some of the principles of one class of Rationalistic authors, he appears to be one of those who indemnify themselves for their maintenance of Christian conclusions by holding most firmly the Rationalistic principles which lead to contrary conclusions, and which, under all circumstances, make Christianity so far as it is received, a variable and uncertain system of mere private opinion.

We have thought it requisite to say thus much in reference to the opinions of the author of the work before us, with a view to guard the reader against the influence of religious views, which are in many instances unsound, but are advanced with a confidence, and an ability, and, in many cases, with an apparently good intention, which tend to carry conviction along with them. Having entered this general protest against the Chevalier's principles, which we may perhaps justify in some degree in the course of the following remarks, we shall proceed to present to the reader some slight general account of the multifarious contents of the extraordinary work before us, and then notice more particularly his remarks on ancient liturgies. Its immediate object is to determine the age and authorship of a work on Heresies, recently discovered in the monasteries of Mount Athos, and published last year at Oxford by the delegates of the University Press, under the editorship of M. Emmanuel Miller. This work, which was ascribed by its editor to Origen, and described in its published title as the "*Philosophumena of Origen*," appears, from internal evidence, to be of very high antiquity—to be, in fact, a work of the third century; but its authorship has given rise to dispute: and the first volume of the Chevalier Bunsen's work is occupied by a series of letters to Archdeacon Hare, in which he maintains, with great learning and acuteness, and, in our view, with conclusive success, that the work in question was written by Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus, in the time of Alexander Severus, or about the year 225 of our era. He argues that Origen cannot have been the author of this work, and that its value is greater than if it had been written by him, because Hippolytus, as a disciple of Irenæus, and twenty years older than Origen, is an earlier witness of Apostolic tradition; nor is he involved in any charge or suspicion of heresy, while as a member of the Roman presbytery he could give the most authentic details of the affairs of the Roman Church. "The book," says Chevalier Bunsen, "gives authentic information on the earliest history of Christianity, and precisely on those most important points of which hitherto we have known very little authentically. It contains extracts from at least fifteen lost

works of the Gnostic, Ebionitic, and mixed heretical schools and parties of the earlier times of Christianity. These extracts begin with the account of heresies which existed in the age of St. Peter and St. Paul, and consequently preceded the Gospel of St. John. They go down, in an uninterrupted line, to the first quarter of the third century. We have here, amongst others, quotations from the Gospel of St. John by Basilides, who flourished in the beginning of the reign of Hadrian, or about the year 117; furnishing a conclusive answer to the unfortunate hypothesis of Strauss, and the whole school of Tubingen, that the fourth Gospel was written about the year 165 or 170." (Preface, p. v.)

The letters to Archdeacon Hare enter fully on the question of the authenticity, authorship, and contents of this remarkable book. It would be impossible to follow the Chevalier in the details of his proofs; but we may take notice of some few of the passages which have particularly attracted our attention. The following remarks, in reference to the earliest heresies, show the bearing of this work on the authenticity and genuineness of the Gospel of St. John:—

"Of all this we knew next to nothing hitherto. It is now clear that we have to deal with sects which were coeval with Peter and Paul, as Simon was. But they started from foreign Judaism, mixed up with the pantheistic mysticism of Asia Minor. Hereby they were also opposed to the Valentinians, who started from Gentile ground; although, being Christians, they could not help drawing Judaism into the sphere of their speculations. Our author, as we shall see presently, derives the Valentinian principles from Simon, and brings Cerinthus, who also belongs to the first century, into connexion with them. But he distinguishes the Ophites entirely from all these, and places them at the head of the whole list, which, he repeatedly says, indicates the order they appeared in. Irenæus represents the Ophites expressly as predecessors of Valentinianism; but the schools he enumerates are evidently mixed up with this system. Nothing is more natural. The first outburst of Gnosticism sprang from a mixture of Christianity with Phrygian Judaism, imbued generally with Gentile speculations, orgies and mysteries. The Jewish element was considered as the least important. But, after Valentinus had taken upon himself to solve that great problem of the world's history, Judaism, by interpreting it as the working of the Demiurg, or the mundane evil principle, those Gnostics appropriated many of the leading speculations and fictions of Valentinianism. Thus we can explain the representation, which Irenæus, in the last two chapters of his first book, gives of the Ophitic systems. We have only now the pure, primitive Ophites before us.

"And are they really unknown to us? I hope, on the contrary, my dear friend, you will agree with me, that most probably we have

here the very heretics to whom the Apostle alludes in the fourth chapter of his First Epistle to Timothy. The 'endless genealogies' (i. 4) must be explained, as many have suggested, of the cosmological genealogies of æons or angels. Here we have them, in the very words of the most ancient sects. All that has been said against the Pauline origin of that Epistle, and of the pastoral letters in general, on the score of the allusions to heretics, thus falls to the ground. I believe I have proved in my 'Letters on Ignatius,' that the internal state of the Church, as to the organization of the congregations, leads irresistibly to the same result.

"But do you not see that the whole scheme of the late origin of the Gospel of St. John falls also to the ground, if our book is authentic, as undoubtedly it is; and if our author deserves credit for the arrangement of his historical account, and justly claims authority for his extracts from the sacred books of those Phrygian-Jewish fathers of Gnosticism? The Ophites all know the Logos, and all worship the Serpent as his symbol, or that of the Demiurg opposed to him; for on that point there seems to have been a difference among them. They refer, however, not to the Logos of Philo, but to the Logos personified in man, and identified with Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Mary. The only admissible alternative, therefore, seems to me to be this. When St. John, towards the end of the first century, wrote down his evidence respecting Jesus the Christ, and placed at the head of his exposition those simple and grand words on the Logos, he either referred to sects who had abused the speculations about the Logos, as God's thought of Himself, or he did not. If he did, as it seems to me impossible to doubt, he cannot have had in mind so much the philosophical followers of Philo, who abhorred the very idea of the personal union of the Logos with Man, as the Christian heretics who perverted this idea in one way or another. This being the case, I maintain that he had before him the very sects which we have now become acquainted with from their own writings, the very titles of which we did not know hitherto. At all events, then, what the Apostle says is not the Christian and popular expression of a speculative system of Valentinianism, but the simple statement of the fact, that the Logos is neither an abstract notion, nor an angel, nor an æon (if that word existed as a term), but that He is one with the Man Jesus, the Christ."—Vol. i. pp. 39—42.

The author proceeds to further proofs from the same work, in favour of the authenticity of St. John's Gospel. The whole of the remarks on the ancient heresies comprised in the second letter, are exceedingly valuable and interesting.

In the third letter we have a detail of the history of the Roman Church, at the commencement of the third century, under Zephyrinus and Callistus. The following account of the life of Pope Callistus or Calixtus, as gathered from Hippolytus, throws a curious light on the history of the Church of Rome.

“ We know that in the latter years of the reign of the unworthy son of the philosophical and virtuous but inefficient emperor Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, his mistress Marcia played a conspicuous part in the history of the palace. She married, as a matter of course it would appear, the captain of the guards, and was believed to exercise a great influence on the emperor. When his brutal temper became unbearable, she was privy to the conspiracy which put him to death by poison and suffocation.

“ Of this Marcia we knew already, from Dion, that she was very kind to the Christians. We learn now from Hippolytus, that she was God-loving (*φιλόθεος*), that is to say, that she had been converted to the Christian faith.

“ The part she acts in the life of Callistus is peculiarly interesting. There was under Commodus, when Victor was bishop of Rome, a good Christian soul called Carpophorus, who had a Christian slave of the name of Callistus. To help him on, he gave him the administration of a bank, which he kept in that celebrated quarter of Rome called the *Piscina publica*. Many brethren and widows trusted their money to this bank, having great faith in the Christian character of Carpophorus. But Callistus turned out a rogue: he made away with the sums intrusted to him; and when the depositors wanted their money, it was gone. Their complaints came before Carpophorus; he asked for the accounts; and when the fraud could no longer be concealed, Callistus made his escape. He ran down to the harbour, Portus, some twenty miles from Rome, found a ship ready to start, and embarked. Carpophorus was not slow to follow him, and found the ship moored in the middle of the harbour. He took a boat to claim the criminal. Callistus, seeing no escape, threw himself into the sea, and was with difficulty saved, and delivered up to his master, who, taking the matter into his own hands, gave him the domestic treadmill of the Roman slave-owners, the *pistrinum*. Some time passed, and, as is wont to happen (says Hippolytus), some brethren came to Carpophorus, and said he ought to give poor Callistus a fair chance of regaining his character, or at least his money. He pretended he had money outstanding, and that, if he could only go about, he should recover it. ‘ Well,’ said good Carpophorus, ‘ let him go and try what he can recover: I do not care much for my own money, but I mind that of the poor widows.’ So Callistus went out on a Sabbath (Saturday), pretending he had to recover some money from the Jews, but in fact having resolved to do something desperate, which might put an end to his life, or give a turn to his case. He went into a synagogue and raised a great riot there, saying he was a Christian, and interrupting their service. The Jews were of course enraged at this insult, fell upon him, beat him, and then carried him before Fuscianus, the prefect of Rome. When this judge, a very severe man, was hearing the cause, somebody recognized Callistus, and ran to tell Carpophorus what was going on. Carpophorus went immediately to the court, and said; ‘ This fellow is no Christian; but wants to get rid of his life, having robbed me of much money, and

will prove.' The Jews, thinking this was a Christian stratagem to save Callistus, insisted upon having him punished for disturbing them in the lawful exercise of their worship. Fuscianus therefore sentenced him to be scourged, and then transported to the unwholesome parts of Sardinia, so fatal to life in summer (Strabo, v. 2. § 7, 8).

"Some time after, says Hippolytus, Marcia, wishing to do a good work, sent for bishop Victor, and asked what Christians had been transported to Sardinia; adding, she would beg the emperor to release them. The bishop made out a list of them; but, being a judicious and righteous man, omitted the name of Callistus, knowing the offence he had committed.

"Marcia obtained the letter of pardon; and Hyacinthus, a eunuch (of the service of the palace undoubtedly), and a presbyter (of the Church), was dispatched to the governor of the island to claim and bring back the martyrs. Hyacinthus delivered his list: and Callistus, finding his name was not upon it, began to lament and entreat, and at last moved Hyacinthus to demand his liberation also. Here the text is somewhat obscure; but thus much is clear, that his liberation was obtained by bringing the name of Marcia into play.

"When Callistus made his appearance, Victor was very much vexed; the scandal had not been forgotten, and Carpophorus (his lawful master) was still alive. So he sent him off to Antium (Porto d'Anzo), and gave him a certain sum a month. Whether it was here Callistus fell in with Zephyrinus, or at Rome itself, no sooner was Carpophorus dead, than Zephyrinus, now become bishop of Rome, made him his coadjutor to keep his clergy in order, and gave himself up to him so entirely, that Callistus did with him what he liked. Unfortunately, says Hippolytus, Zephyrinus was not only very stupid and ignorant, but, loving money very much, took bribes. Things went on in this way until Zephyrinus died, when Callistus was elected to the eminent post he had coveted all the time. He became bishop of Rome, and the theological disputes in that Church began to be envenomed."—Vol. i. pp. 126—131.

According to Hippolytus, this Callistus favoured the heresy of Noetus, and established a school in which this heresy was taught, in opposition to the doctrine of the Church, and accordingly it is stated that Theodoret mentions the Callistians as heretics, under the head of the Noetians (pp. 133, 134).

In the fourth letter, the author produces the Confession of Faith of Hippolytus, and subjoins a commentary, in which by a process of reasoning, which appears perfectly unaccountable and most inconclusive, he arrives at the conclusion that Hippolytus was a Rationalist, and then proceeds into a long declamation against those who do not interpret Scripture in accordance with reason, or refuse to deal with it on Rationalistic principles. The Formularies and Creeds of the Church also, according to him, must be rejected, wherever they are opposed to reason (p. 174).

On the whole we must award to the Chevalier the praise of great literary research and ability in this series of letters on Hippolytus.

The second volume contains a development of the author's views on theological subjects, which abound in the mysticism of German ideas and in intolerant attacks on all who do not agree with him. The latter part of this volume comprises most important matter, in reference to the various texts and forms of the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, and amply deserves an attentive examination by all who are interested in the state of the primitive Church. There is also much in the third volume which is equally curious and valuable, mixed up with a number of unsound notions. The Chevalier here presents his own reconstruction of the whole discipline and worship of the Church, in the second and third centuries, founded on the Apostolical Canons. He describes the constitution of the Church as Episcopal, a bishop being placed in each town, aided by several presbyters and deacons; but all questions of importance being submitted to the decision of the whole congregation of the town. In this view we believe the Chevalier is quite correct, as he is in stating that the bishop was ordained by the bishops of neighbouring towns, and the presbyters and deacons by the bishop; and that bishops acknowledged a certain precedence in the bishop of the metropolitan city of each province; and that the village congregations were presided over by Chorepiscopi, or rural bishops. To reduce our episcopal polity to the primitive model, each of our bishops ought to be a metropolitan, and every large town in the diocese, where there are three or more incumbents, should be an episcopal see.

We regret that our space prevents us from taking more than a cursory survey of the contents of M. Bunsen's work, which furnishes material for extensive and interesting discussions, and is altogether one of the most remarkable productions of modern times. We hasten to that division of his work which possesses special interest for us, because it appears to be the most carefully elaborated, and that to which his attention has been the longest directed. We allude to the second part of the fourth volume, which comprises the results of his researches on the subject of the early Liturgies.

In reference to this part of the Chevalier's work, we cheerfully recognize in the author an adequate amount of learning, a spirit of intelligent criticism, and a thorough enthusiasm, which has led him through a series of researches and literary labours, such as perhaps few persons can adequately appreciate, and which have certainly thrown new light on various branches of the subject.

We must own, that in the perusal of this part of the Chevalier Bunsen's work we have frequently found ourselves unable to follow him into the conclusions he has drawn; nevertheless we must tender to him an expression of thanks which is amply due to honest and learned research, and ingenious speculation. The results which he produces by the application of a process of critical reasoning, are such as would, if well-founded, be of the most extreme importance and interest. They would effect a restoration of the language of the Liturgy of the Christian Church in the second century. Independently of this great feature in his work, there are points of value in it which will render it absolutely indispensable to all who are desirous of instituting researches on liturgical subjects. The Greek texts of the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom are here for the first time printed from the Codex Barberinus, a MS. of the eighth century,—the oldest manuscript in which those Liturgies are preserved; and the texts of the Eastern and Western Liturgies are examined with the aid of criticism based on historical evidence, and freed from comparatively modern additions and interpolations.

It would seem that no part of this work has been so carefully elaborated, or is the result of such long preparation as that which treats of the ancient Liturgies. The author commences his treatise in the following terms:—

“ It is impossible to enter into the sanctuary of Christian devotion, and undertake a historical review of the sublime thought of worship through eighteen centuries, without feeling overawed by the magnitude and holiness of the subject. I approach this sacred task not without a long preparation, nor without a deep feeling of responsibility; but without fear. For I am conscious of entering into the precincts of that sanctuary with unfeigned reverence, and with no other object than that of pointing out the world-historical importance of that idea of Christian worship, the picture of which I have attempted to draw in the preceding volume. I do so, moreover, with sincere charity towards all Christian creeds. From that point of view, all party animosities appear as senseless as they are culpable. It is as untrue and unmeaning, as it is unworthy and odious, to attempt to explain by outward circumstances, or to attribute to base personal motives, great spiritual movements and liturgical forms, which have exercised, and are exercising, a supreme power over millions and millions of civilized people, and which are objects of respect and awe to nations, and spiritual guides to noble and holy minds. Finally, I believe that the true Christian philosopher cannot but discern, through all the deviations and all the aberrations in that history of the religious mind which he has to observe and to record during fifteen centuries, and through all the bitter contention and conflicting anathemas of priests and theologians which assail him on his

way of peace, the fundamental Christian idea of the reunion of the mind of mortal man with God, by thankful sacrifice of self, in life, and, therefore, also in worship."—Vol. iv. pp. 135, 136.

The concluding words of this passage are deserving of remark, as connected with the doctrine of the universal priesthood of Christians, which appears in Germany to have superseded the doctrine of justification by faith, as the leading dogma of Christianity. That the universal priesthood of Christians is taught by Scripture is indeed a most certain truth (see 1 Peter ii. 5. 9; Rev. i. 6); but we see very plainly that this truth is frequently put forward by men who do not receive the doctrine of the Atonement, or the offering of the Son of God, as a sacrifice for the sins of the world. Their idea of sacrifice is that of man offering up his own merits and works to God; the Christian notion of sacrifice is the offering up of the body of Christ on the altar of the cross as an atonement for the sins of the world; and the worthlessness of all man's offerings, except as made pleasing through the merits of the Redeemer, applied by faith. The notion of the universal priesthood of Christians, when used by an orthodox believer, is far remote from the conceptions of the merely philosophical and rationalizing German theologian. By the former it is used in opposition to that gross error of Romanism, which has converted the Eucharist into a sacrifice of atonement for the sins of the living and the dead,—a continuation of the sacrifice on the cross; or as a service of gratitude for the spiritual graces and privileges conferred on the elect people of God. By the latter it is regarded in a Pelagian and heathen sense, as the perfect offering of beings who have no original sin, and who need no Mediator and Intercessor—men, who have a right to regard themselves as inspired by the Holy Ghost, and equal in wisdom and knowledge to the Prophets and Apostles, and our Lord Himself; ay, and authorized to correct and amend the ideas which the founders of Christianity have transmitted to us in the Scriptures.

We have no doubt that we shall be considered as woefully benighted, and to the last degree bigotted and prejudiced, when we declare that we most strongly suspect the faith of many of those who in the present day make such free use of the doctrine of the universal priesthood of Christians. That doctrine, *when detached from the doctrine of original sin, and of the atonement and intercession of Christ, is nothing more than a heresy and an infidelity.* It is such a doctrine as Luther, and Melancthon, and all the Reformers would have rejected with horror. We know that this doctrine is often put forward by men of sound faith, in order to meet certain errors; but we could much wish that they

would be guarded in its use, and take care to discriminate the Scriptural doctrine on this subject from the view taken by Rationalists and Unbelievers, who are for ever urging the universal priesthood of Christians, and whose object is in this way to destroy all the influence of the Christian ministry, and in fact to put an end to the office of the ministry, under the pretence that every man is his own priest. In making these remarks, we would not wish to be understood as imputing to the Chevalier Bunsen all the grave errors of which we have been speaking¹; we are merely referring to tendencies in certain directions. This writer is of opinion, that we find in the records of Christian antiquity, and especially in its Liturgies, the fundamental idea of the thankful sacrifice of self. We do not deny that this idea *does* present itself in Christian antiquity, but it is not by any means the prominent idea of sacrifice in the Liturgies.

The Chevalier thus describes the contents of his collection of Liturgies:—

“ The collection of documents contained in the ‘ *Reliquiæ Sacræ* ’ exhibits all the ancient sacramental texts of the East, and the few relics respecting the Eucharistic Service of the Churches of Africa, Gaul, and Spain (with which those of Alemannia, of Great Britain, and of Ireland were identical), of the second, third, and fourth centuries, and of the early part of the fifth. As to the Church of Rome, they naturally go down to the end of the sixteenth century, or the time of Gregory the Great. The general principles of historical criticism, according to which this collection has been framed, will be sufficiently explained in the following pages. Having made them the basis of an extensive ‘ *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiæ universæ*, ’ as long as thirty-five years ago, I have found them constantly confirmed by my subsequent studies; and I feel sure that I cannot be wrong in the principal points, because philological facts, historical criticism, and philosophical research have led me to the same result. Whoever follows the method I have adopted will be able to find his way through the sixty or more Liturgies of the East.”—Vol. iv. p. 137.

The “ method of the critical historical school,” which he has applied to the illustration of these Liturgies, enables him, he thinks, to solve all the questions and difficulties affecting them. We are not aware that there is any particular novelty in the ideas on which the Chevalier has proceeded in these Liturgies: we should say that any one, who had undertaken the task he has set for himself, would have gone to work in just the same way; i. e. he would have sought for the oldest texts, and endeavoured to have

¹ We see in his work, and gladly acknowledge, the expression of a belief in the atonement and sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ.

reduced them to the purest possible state by the collation of manuscripts, and by comparison with the writings of the ancients. He would, in fine, have ascended to the original form and substance of those Liturgies by a comparison of the documents received in common in after ages by different or hostile parties. This is what the Chevalier has actually done, and, as far as he goes, very creditably; though, we imagine, that he has by no means exhausted his subject, and that others may hereafter throw still more light on the subject. He has not been able to advance beyond Renaudot's text in his edition of the Coptic and Syriac Liturgies; for the Chevalier's researches in these directions proceed on the basis of Renaudot's text and translation. Now we do not feel any confidence that Renaudot's version may not be improved; and, for ourselves, we have always been of opinion that the *very first step* towards a critical edition of the ancient Liturgies, should be a full and careful investigation of the most ancient extant manuscripts of the Syriac and Coptic Liturgies, which are the purest remains of the Oriental and Egyptian rites. Without this we conceive the work of criticism cannot be depended on.

The Chevalier gives a slight but interesting sketch of the history of Liturgical studies and criticism from the period of the Reformation to the present day. He remarks that the Controversies of the Reformation led at first to the defence by the Romish party of the genuineness of the old Liturgies, with their interpolations and forgeries. He carries on the subject afterwards to the time of Renaudot, the continuator of the "*Perpetuité de la Foi touchant l'Eucharistie*," and notices his critical labours and researches in connexion with the Oriental Liturgies. After alluding to the labours of other Roman Catholic Ritualists of that period, he describes the eminent services rendered to the cause by the researches of Bingham, whose collections from the writings of St. Chrysostom and the other Fathers relative to the Liturgy, furnish invaluable materials for criticism.

The other subsequent writers, such as Augusti, Binterim, and Assemani, added nothing to the critical knowledge of the Liturgies; and it is to be regretted that no effort was made to gain improved texts, or to institute further researches.

The author thus refers to the labours of Ritualists in England:—

"It is only within the last twenty years that two English writers have taken up the subject with great earnestness: the Rev. William Palmer, in the first volume of his '*Origines Liturgicæ*' (1832); and the Rev. John Mason Neale, in the first two volumes of his '*History of the Holy Greek Church*' (1850). The former of these works, in

particular, is full of learned and ingenious remarks on the connexion and families of the ancient Liturgies. The author proves that many of them contain the same liturgical elements, and sometimes in the same order or almost so. But when from these coincidences he draws the conclusion, that the text of the Liturgy of a given Church represents on the whole a very early period, because it contains materials and elements of an early date, and that two Liturgies in which certain analogies occur are essentially the same, this appears rather a hasty proceeding, and is not a step in advance in historical criticism. Renaudot was satisfied with making an assertion; Mr. Palmer draws conclusions from it, as if it were proved. His merit is the better establishment of liturgical families according to the leading Churches of Christendom. Beyond this point he is not able to prove any thing but what was acknowledged before; namely, that there were liturgical formularies at a very early period, and that there was much analogy between them."—Vol. iv. pp. 146, 147.

It seems to us that the Chevalier Bunsen, in the preceding remarks, scarcely does justice to the critical results of Mr. Palmer's work on Liturgies. Previously to the appearance of that dissertation, writers supposed with Bingham, that there was some one original liturgy to which they endeavoured to accommodate all the expressions made use of in the writings of the Fathers bearing on liturgical subjects; or else they contended that certain liturgies were written by St. Mark, or St. James, or other Fathers, or denied their genuineness altogether, and regarded them as worthless.

Renaudot, as the Chevalier very truly remarks, laid down a very true and important principle with reference to the Oriental Liturgies; that when liturgies substantially the same were in use by the Monophysites and the Orthodox, those liturgies must be older than the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451. But Renaudot not only carries out this theory most imperfectly, especially in the case of the Egyptian Liturgies, where he has made more than one great mistake; but his object is to maintain the genuineness of the liturgies—to prove that they were written by St. Mark and St. James; and he rarely applies the writings of the Fathers to the illustration of the liturgies, except on the view that there was a common liturgy to which writers in all parts refer. His work is consequently extremely confused and contradictory as soon as we get beyond the text and the general facts, and attempt to gather any theory as to the origin of the liturgies.

Now here Mr. Palmer has made a great advance; for in the first place he has adopted and applied the sound critical principle above referred to, and carried it carefully and accurately out, as far as his materials permitted; and has thus been enabled

to gain the firm standing-ground of historical certainty as regards the substance of the Oriental and Egyptian Liturgies prior to the Council of Chalcedon. In addition to this he is the first writer who has ever attempted to treat the origin and history of the Roman and Constantinopolitan Liturgies on any critical principles. Another peculiar feature in Mr. Palmer's "*Origines*" is, that he has uniformly connected the notices of the Fathers and Councils with the liturgies of their own localities, instead of endeavouring to refer them to some imaginary universal liturgy. For instance, he applies the writings of the Egyptian Fathers to the illustration of the Egyptian Liturgies, and the Syrian Fathers to the Syrian Liturgies. In examining the writings of Chrysostom, and the numerous references to the liturgy contained in them, he remembers that some of those works were written at Antioch and others at Constantinople; and they are applied accordingly as evidences of the nature of the liturgy in each place. In the whole of his dissertation on primitive liturgies Mr. Palmer proceeded on the principles of historical criticism; and if he has made conjectures, or stated probabilities in reference to some parts of his subject, he has avoided the use of positive language. From the Chevalier Bunsen's language it might be supposed that Mr. Palmer ascribed an Apostolical origin to the language of the existing liturgies. This is not the case: he only argues that the principal substance and order of rites have been handed down from the remotest antiquity, and probably owe their origin to the Apostles. In fact, he does not contend for the antiquity of the texts as much as the Chevalier himself does.

Mr. Neale's work, on the "*History of the Holy Oriental Church*," is a very valuable accession to the available means of acquiring knowledge on liturgical subjects. We conceive that it is indispensable to every one who wishes to pursue the subject to any depth; while, at the same time, the remark of the Chevalier, as to its non-critical character, is, to a considerable extent, well founded. The Chevalier has omitted here to mention another valuable work on liturgical subjects recently published. The Rev. G. P. Badger's work on the Nestorians comprises much detail of a very interesting character on the Nestorian ritual; but it is not based on any criticism.

M. Bunsen lays down some very sound principles preparatory to his undertaking. "An antiquarian research, if it is to lead to any result, must be based upon the knowledge of two points: first, of what the documents now in existence can teach us, and what they cannot teach us; and, secondly, of what is possible, and what is impossible, in a given period of the ancient Church." (p. 148.) On this principle he first gives a sketch of the general

characteristics of the Eucharistic service at different periods, commencing with the Apostolic and later ages. During the first epoch, or the age of St. Peter and St. Paul, he remarks that the Eucharist was celebrated in connexion with the Agapæ: during the age of St. John, these were separated; and the invocation of the Holy Spirit, as the consecrating formula, was perhaps introduced, with some other verses and phrases mentioned by the Chevalier. In this place, the author appears to introduce a conjecture, which can scarcely be made the groundwork of any historical criticism. His argument for the antiquity of this invocation is ingenious; but we think it not very conclusive. The Marcionites, at the end of the second century, according to Tertullian, used the Lord's Prayer, but with a singular variation. Instead of the supplication, "Thy kingdom come," they read, "The Holy Ghost descend upon us and purify us." Moreover, it seems that Gregory of Nyssa and Maximus in after times speak of this as "an ancient and authentic reading."—(Bunsen, iii. p. 266.)

The author next assumes that this alteration can only be accounted for by the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer; and that this must have been the invocation in use in the first century. (p. 273.) But does it not seem that this conjecture is exceedingly uncertain! Why must those words have been introduced in reference to the Eucharist? There is no allusion to the Eucharist—nothing except a prayer for the Holy Ghost. If, indeed, this alteration was as old as the first century, as Bunsen argues; and if it was even recognized by Catholic writers, such as Gregory and Maximus, how does it happen that in all liturgies, and in all the writings of the Fathers, and in all the MSS., the other reading is found? We hold, therefore, that as regards the Church, there is evidence that such an invocation could never have been used in the liturgy; and with regard to the Marcionites, we must say that this alteration is sufficiently accounted for by the practice of the early heretics, who mutilated and interpolated the Holy Scriptures without the slightest scruple. M. Bunsen will have it, that the invocation of the Holy Spirit at the Eucharist in the early ages, had reference *not* to the sacramental elements, but to the recipients; but this view is certainly inconsistent with the whole of the extant liturgies; and even with the Abyssinian Liturgy, which he refers to A.D. 150, for in this last there is an invocation for the descent of the Holy Spirit on the "offerings," as well as the recipients.—(Vol. iv. p. 162.)

The Chevalier continues his remarks on the epochs of liturgies by describing the general character of the service in the "Igna-

tian and Polycarpian age, A.D. 100 to 170 ;” and here transcribes the well-known passages from the Apology of Justin Martyr (Chapters 65, 66, and 67), in which the order of the liturgy is detailed in exact accordance with that of the Oriental Liturgies of later times. M. Bunsen contends, but we think without sufficient reason, that the expression in Chapter 66, δι’ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ’ αὐτοῦ, refers to the use of the Lord’s Prayer in the Eucharist; but we think that if the consecration had really been ascribed to the Lord’s Prayer, as the Chevalier supposes, we should have found some mention of that prayer in Chapters 65 and 67, where the order of service and the substance of the thanksgiving are carefully detailed. It is evident that this thanksgiving was something altogether different from the Lord’s Prayer. Yet *this* is evidently the εὐχῆς λόγος by which the eucharistic “food” was εὐχαριστέῃσα or “blessed.” We therefore infer that the meaning of Justin Martyr is, that the “word of prayer” then used proceeds from God, or was authorized or appointed by Him, but not that the Lord’s Prayer constituted the thanksgiving or blessing. We would refer in confirmation of the correctness of this interpretation, even to the Liturgy which the Chevalier regards as coeval with Justin Martyr, the Abyssinian (p. 161). The Lord’s Prayer is not found in that liturgy; but there is a long thanksgiving. How can we reconcile this fact with the interpretation put by the Chevalier on Justin Martyr’s words? He accounts for it by supposing that the Lord’s Prayer is omitted because it is familiar to all the people; but surely the same reason would be applicable generally, and yet in all other liturgies that prayer is introduced. It is a fact that even in the fifth century all Churches did not yet make use of the Lord’s Prayer at the Eucharist, as we may gather from St. Augustine’s words: “Quam totam petitionem fere omnis Ecclesia Dominica oratione concludit.”

We shall pass over some intervening matter, and come at once to the discussion of a subject of unequalled interest and importance in the field of liturgical inquiry. We refer to the process by which the author institutes a comparison between the Liturgy of the Alexandrian Church commonly called “St. Mark’s,” and the Ethiopic Liturgy published by Ludolf, and from which he elicits the striking result that in the latter we have an authentic and uninterpolated record of the Liturgy as performed in the second century. We think the Chevalier has scarcely brought before the reader, with sufficient distinctness, the chain of reasoning by which he has arrived at this brilliant result; but we shall

² Augustin. Epist. cxlix. p. 509, tom. ii. Oper. Ed. Benedict.

endeavour to state it somewhat more simply than he has done; and we feel assured that every one must acknowledge the extreme ingenuity of the argument.

The Liturgy of St. Mark, then, as now extant, is the ancient Liturgy of the Alexandrian Church, enlarged and interpolated in various ages, more especially from the eighth to the eleventh century, when it received several additions in imitation of the rites of the Church of Constantinople, to which it was then subjected. The most solemn and important part of this liturgy, however, the Anaphora or proper service of the Eucharist, has comparatively few of these interpolations. It breathes throughout the spirit of early antiquity, except in some short passages of later date. It even supposes the persecutions to be still continuing. This Anaphora of the Alexandrian Liturgy commences with the usual form "Sursum Corda," &c., after which follows a thanksgiving, and then long prayers for all estates of men. Now Mr. Palmer has shown that Origen actually quotes these prayers *verbatim*, whence it follows that in this liturgy we have the text of the Alexandrian Liturgy as in use about A.D. 220 or 230:—

"At the same time, that Greek text, in that very same prayer in particular, contains so many repetitions and palpable interpolations, as for instance, the prayer for the 'orthodox emperor,' that the only question which arises is, whether it be possible to separate the more ancient elements of the Origenian age from the latter, from those of the Athanasian or a subsequent period.

"Now this critical operation would scarcely be possible, did we not possess in the Abyssinian collection the original form of the same liturgy as it stood in the second century. By this link we are enabled, first, to extract from our present text all that corresponds to the primitive groundwork. This being done, the Precatory Prayer, and the prayer and chanting of the 'Trisagion,' or the 'Holy, holy, holy,' are found to be the only entirely new parts; all the rest is rather an amplification of a more simple form, than something entirely new. We shall afterwards find, that the 'Trisagion' came into general use from and through Antioch, where it was primitive.

"In this manner we are enabled, with great safety, to enucleate the Origenian text of the third century, out of that of the sixth or seventh, which has come down to us in one Greek manuscript, and is preserved in the liturgies of the Jacobites."—Vol. iv. p. 155.

Now in comparing the two liturgies together, it appears that "St. Mark's" Liturgy comprises all the substance of the Abyssinian, in the same order, only somewhat amplified; but it makes one or two additions—the prayers for all men, and the "Tersanctus." The prayers for all men are as old as Origen's age; and we think, the "Tersanctus" also. This being the case, the

remainder must be much older; and must, in fact, have existed at latest from the middle of the second century. The Chevalier's words are these:—

“If the amplification of the ancient liturgy preserved to us by the Abyssinians was already a received ecclesiastical formulary in the time of Origen, or about the year 230, it is clear that it cannot have been established later than about the year 200. It follows from this, that the origin of the groundwork itself can scarcely have been later than about 150. But the Apostolic beauty and simplicity of the ancient primitive form speaks best for itself. We give it therefore here in an English translation, referring our learned readers to the original text.”
—Vol. iv. p. 161.

We shall follow the example of the author, and give this ancient Liturgy at full length, because we deem it one of the purest remains of this kind, and our subsequent remarks will be better understood:—

“THE EUCHARIST, OR THANKSGIVING.

“The Lord be with you all:

And with thy spirit.

Lift up your hearts:

We have lifted them up unto the Lord.

Let us give thanks to the Lord:

It is right and meet.

“We give Thee thanks, O Lord, through Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ, whom in the last days Thou hast sent to us, a Saviour and Redeemer, the angel of Thy counsel, the Word which is of Thee, through which Thou hast made all things by Thy will. And Thou hast sent Him from heaven into the womb of the Virgin. He was made flesh and was borne in her womb. And He was manifested Thy Son by the Holy Ghost that He might fulfil Thy will: and that He might gather Thee a people by expanding His hands: He suffered that He might liberate the sufferers who confide in Thee. He was by His will given over to suffer death, that He might dissolve death and break the bonds of Satan, and that He might tread hell under His feet, and bring out the saints and make ordinances, and bring to light resurrection.

“He, therefore, took the bread, and gave thanks and said: Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you. And likewise the cup, and said: This is my blood, which is shed for you; do this, as oft as ye shall do it, in remembrance of me.

(Oblation and Consecration of People and Elements.)

“Recollecting, therefore, His death and His resurrection, we offer to Thee this bread and this cup, giving thanks to Thee that Thou hast made us worthy to stand before Thee, and perform the office of priests to Thee: and we supplicate and pray Thee, that Thou mayest send

Thy Holy Spirit upon the offerings of this Church, and likewise that Thou mayest give holiness to all those who partake of them ; that they may be filled with the Holy Ghost, that their faith may be confirmed in truth, that they may praise and magnify Thee in Thy Son Jesus Christ, in whom be to Thee praise and power in the Holy Church, now and ever, and in ages of ages. *Amen.*

“ The People : As it was, is, and shall be, in generations of generations, and in ages of ages. *Amen.*

The Deacon : You who stand, bow down your heads.

(Special Consecration of the kneeling People.)

“ Eternal Lord, who knowest what is hidden : Thy people have bowed down to Thee their heads, and have laid down before Thee the hardness of heart and flesh. Look down upon them from Thy established habitation, and bless these men and these women. Strengthen them by the virtue of Thy right hand, and protect them from all evil suffering. Be Thou their guardian, as well of their bodies as of their souls. Increase to them and to us faith and fear through Thy only Son, in whom be to Thee with Him and with the Holy Spirit, praise and power, for ever, and in ages of ages. *Amen.*

“ The Deacon : Let us look up.

The Bishop : The Holy to those who are holy.

The People : One alone is Holy, the Father :

One alone is Holy, the Son :

One alone is Holy, the Spirit.

The Bishop : The Lord be with you all.

The People : And with thy spirit.

Hymn (of Thanksgiving).

[The People draw near and partake of the Communion.]

(Prayer after the Communion of the People.)

“ Lord, Ruler of all, Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ : we render Thee thanks, that Thou hast vouchsafed to us to partake of Thy holy mystery : may it not be to us to judgment nor to condemnation, but to the renewing of the soul, of the body, and of the mind : through Thy only Son, in whom, &c.

“ The People : Amen.

The Presbyter : The Lord be with you all.

[The Imposition of Hands after the Communion.]

(Final Consecration, or Sealing of the People.)

“ Eternal Lord, who governest all things : Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ : Bless these Thy servants and these Thy hand-maidens. Protect and help and save them by the power of Thy angels. Keep and strengthen them in Thy fear through Thy Majesty ; enlighten

them that they think of what is of Thee: and grant to them that they may believe what is of Thee. Give to them concord without sin and wrath: through Thy only Son, in whom, &c.

"The People: Amen.
The Bishop: The Lord be with you all.
The People: And with Thy spirit.
The Deacon: Go home in peace."

[This is the end of the Thanksgiving.]

Vol. iv. pp. 161—164.

This venerable relic of Christian antiquity certainly merits to the full the commendations which are awarded to it. We must say that as a whole the form is truly primitive, and perfectly in accordance with the spirit and style of the second century, as exhibited in the works of Justin, and Irenæus, and the Epistle of the Church at Lyons, and the martyrdom of Polycarp.

We are not absolutely certain of the antiquity of the form "*Sancta Sanctis*," which appears here, and the Chevalier Bunsen himself omits one or two passages on conjecture. But, take it altogether, there is nothing in the above Liturgy that might not have been very well used in the time of Justin Martyr or Polycarp.

This is certainly a matter of great weight and importance in itself; and, looking at the Liturgy as it stands, we confess that we are strongly inclined to ascribe to it the same early antiquity as the author before us does. Nevertheless, we see one most serious difficulty in the way, which does not seem to have occurred to the Chevalier. The origin of the present Abyssinian Church is traced to Frumentius, who converted the Ethiopians and their king, and was ordained the first Bishop of Ethiopia by St. Athanasius, about the middle of the fourth century. Now here is the earliest date which can be ascribed to the Abyssinian Liturgy *as such*—if it be older than that date it must have existed in Egypt, not in Abyssinia. But if it was then brought from Egypt, we find it difficult to suppose that it was the original form of the Egyptian Liturgy, prior to the rite used even in the time of Origen, upwards of a hundred years before; for why should a disused text be revived for the special use of Abyssinia? Would not the more natural and probable course be, to translate the liturgy then in use in Alexandria for the Ethiopic Church, rather than to revive an obsolete text? If this Abyssinian Liturgy was brought from Egypt in A. D. 350, and was the original Egyptian Liturgy, it had been disused for 150 years; for the text of the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Mark is traced by M. Bunsen to the year 200 at latest. On the other hand, if the Liturgy were composed for the

Ethiopic Church, in A. D. 350 or subsequently, it would not furnish any evidence of what the primitive Alexandrian Liturgy was. We own that we do not see any way of escaping this difficulty: we do not see how it is possible to argue with the slightest degree of probability that this liturgy is older than A. D. 350, and older than "St. Mark's" Liturgy; and of course, in this case, the Chevalier's whole critical process of dealing with the text of St. Mark's Liturgy is based on unsound principles, and he has not really effected any advance in this direction. We most sincerely regret that so great a difficulty should present itself to the reception of his view, for it is without exception the most striking theory we have ever seen advanced on these subjects, and has so much to recommend it, that we relinquish it with extreme reluctance, and we should feel really indebted to the Chevalier if he would meet what appears to us a formidable difficulty. It may be said, we know, that some one of the Apostles preached in Ethiopia; but there is certainly every appearance that Christianity was introduced amongst a heathen nation by Frumentius.

The Chevalier next produces the prayer for all conditions of men from the Alexandrian Liturgy of St. Mark, which he shows to be older than the time of Origen, and here we agree with him; and he then continues thus:—

"This, then, is the origin and progress of the Liturgy of the Church of Alexandria, in the second and third periods of the liturgical development, in its essential parts. It spread, not only over Egypt, Libya, and the Pentapolis, but was, in the fourth century, also introduced into Abyssinia. At that time it had already received the form of the fourth period. We possess the Abyssinian form as it is preserved in use by that Church. We have, besides, the Greek text, called the Liturgy of St. Mark, used by those among the Christians of Egypt who are united with the see of Constantinople or Rome. Finally, we have a Coptic text (of which the Arabic translation has not yet been found) used by the so-called Jacobites, that is to say, by the independent Christians of the Church of Egypt, anathematized as Monophysites by an equally one-sided and fanatical majority, which was supported by the strong arm of the emperors of Byzantium. They use the Liturgy called that of St. Cyril, from the fanatical Alexandrian patriarch (about 415), to whose doctrine respecting the unity of Christ's nature the Egyptian priests clung, in violent reaction against the more Antiochene speculations of the Council of Chalcedon.

"I have placed these three texts in three parallel columns, leaving out what is found only in one of them. What remains gives us the text of the middle of the fourth century."—Vol. iv. pp. 167, 168.

Here, as it seems to us, the Chevalier proceeds on sound principles of historical criticism, and we are indebted to him for an

advance in liturgical knowledge. The comparison of the Greek of St. Mark's and the Coptic of St. Cyril's Liturgy, would give us the substance and form of the Alexandrian Liturgy prior to A.D. 451, or the Council of Chalcedon; and a comparison of this result with the Ethiopic General Canon would enable us with some probability to determine the same points in reference to the time of St. Athanasius and Frumentius. We must confess, however, that there is no absolute certainty that the Ethiopic General Canon was introduced into Ethiopia so early as the time of Frumentius: it *may* have been received in later times; and the Abyssinian Liturgy published by Ludolf *may* have been the liturgy used in the time of Frumentius³. We see no grounds for any positive assertion on one side or other of this question; yet we incline to agree with the Chevalier.

We have been much interested in the critical recension of the text of St. Mark's Liturgy, with the aid of the Coptic Liturgy of Cyril, and the Ethiopic General Canon, which is found at pp. 270—323. The annotations, however, are less full than they might have been. We should have expected from the Chevalier's learning some explanation of the various rites occurring in the introductory part of this liturgy, which are evidently derived from the Byzantine liturgies; and indeed the same may be said of some parts of the Anaphora. We also remark several references to important passages in Origen, as having been previously made; but, on looking back for those references, we have not been able to discover them. However, on the whole, we feel indebted for several good and valuable suggestions with reference to the interpolations in the text; and we are of opinion that the Chevalier has done much towards the restoration of this ancient liturgy in its ante-Nicene form.

We next turn to the Liturgy of St. James, as it is called; that is, the ancient liturgy of the Antiochene rite, named after the first Bishop of Jerusalem. The Chevalier has instituted a critical examination into the text of this liturgy, and has done much towards restoring it to its ancient state, as it was in the fourth century. But here we regret that the Chevalier has, for the sake of saving space, omitted to place the Syriac Liturgy in parallel columns with the Greek. An important element in his argument is here omitted. We conceive that, in order to a critical edition of this liturgy, not only should the Syriac Liturgy

³ The fact that the Abyssinian Liturgy of Ludolf and Tattam is *included* in the Ethiopic General Canon, but with considerable additions, and its greater simplicity, would seem to infer the later date of the Ethiopic General Canon; and in this case we should carry back the other Liturgy to the time of Frumentius, but not beyond it.

be compared with the Greek, but a careful examination should be instituted into the correctness of Renaudot's version. The Chevalier refers to the Commentary of James, Bishop of Edessa, A.D. 650, in which the ritual of Antioch is carefully described and compared with that of the Alexandrian Church. This Commentary is of great value and importance, and aids materially in determining the text of the Syriac Liturgies in the middle of the seventh century. At the same time, it must be remarked, that the comparison of the Greek and Syriac Liturgies does in fact enable us to carry back the common materials to a period prior to the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451; and the minute details of Cyril of Jerusalem give us that liturgy as it stood A.D. 350.

We extract some of the author's remarks on the Liturgy of Antioch :—

“ The Liturgy called after St. James, both in the Greek and Syriac, and in all cognate forms, is fully as much corrupted as that of St. Mark, and unfortunately we have not here the same safe basis for reconstructive criticism which the Abyssinian ordinances have preserved to us of the Church of Alexandria. We cannot, therefore, think of restoring the primitive text of the second century ; but we may attempt to reconstitute, in its essential parts, the genuine text of the fourth century, and perhaps that of the Origenian age. And, indeed, we are not without critical resources for restoring the ancient text, by consulting, first, the text itself, and then the testimonies of ancient ecclesiastical writers. Now, if, in the first place, we apply the principle above established, that nothing can be primitive which is not common both to the Byzantines and the national Church, the result is remarkable enough. For what remains, as the common heirloom which they had inherited from their fathers, is entirely connected in all its parts, and presents an organic whole, totally distinct from the senseless agglomerations of forms in the text which we are condemned to read, and so many dispersed congregations in the East to see celebrated. This restored text may therefore be considered as the genuine voice and tradition of the illustrious Church of Antioch ; and, if we compare it with the two ante-Nicene forms of the Alexandrian Church, we find that it exhibits a worthy parallel to the Origenian form, or to the Alexandrian Liturgy of the third century, with enough originality to prove itself an independent offshoot of the Apostolic age. The tradition points to Ignatius, the bishop and martyr of Antioch, as having by divine inspiration ordained the Liturgy of that Church, and in particular its psalmody. Psalmody, indeed, is the striking original feature of the Antiochene ritual, from beginning to end. The Trisagion, or the ‘ Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth ; heaven and earth are full of thy glory,’ which at Alexandria is evidently a later insertion, appears here in its original place, and must therefore have spread from Antioch to Alexandria, and probably also to Asia Minor and to Byzantium.

"The result we gain by this first critical operation is fully confirmed by that of the second, namely, the examination of the passages in the writers of this age which illustrate our service.

"Of these, Theodoretus, Bishop of Cyrus, in Syria, in the beginning of the fifth century, when that district belonged to the patriarchate of Antioch, mentions as the beginning of the Communion Service, the Apostolical benediction taken from the conclusion of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.' The Constantinopolitan Communion Service begins with the same Apostolic blessing, which points to a derivation from Antioch.

"As to the singing of the 33rd Psalm during the communion, the custom is mentioned by Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem about 340, as that of Jerusalem, and by St. Jerome as that of Palestine.

"Cyril has given us, in the eloquent delineation of this holy rite in his fifth Mystagogic Catechesis (printed in vol. iv. B. of Assemani, and translated in Augusti's *Denkwürdigkeiten*), a complete catechetical commentary on the Liturgy of Jerusalem, which, according to tradition and history, is identical with that of Antioch. We give, therefore, the substance of his commentary, as a liturgical record of what in his time was the established Liturgy, the voice of the Church, and as securing, at all events, the framework of the Liturgy in the early part of the fourth century."—Vol. iv. pp. 169—171.

This will give a general idea of the critical labours of the Chevalier in connexion with the Antiochene Liturgy.

The author observes in the following passage, that the Oriental Liturgy of Antioch is the parent of the Byzantine rites:

"The Antiochene form is certainly the principal groundwork of the Constantinopolitan Liturgies, which have exercised so decided an influence upon Eastern Christendom, and perhaps, through Asia Minor, upon the Western Churches.

"But there is no doubt that it possessed besides a considerable influence, and subsequently a decided authority over a considerable portion of Asia, and in particular over a part of Asia Minor. The existence of an original Liturgy of Asia Minor, distinct from the Antiochene, is a mere conjecture; we have no quotations or other evidence to support it. Historical criticism, therefore, can take no notice of any such conjectures. What we know is, that a learned Syrian bishop, only fifty years later than Gregory the Great, expressly states that there were but two great classes of ancient liturgies, and that the 'provinces inhabited by the Greeks' agreed in the distinctive part with Antioch."—Vol. iv. p. 184.

The allusion here is to the conjecture of Mr. Palmer in his *Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies*, Section V., where he argues that the Council of Laodicea in the fourth century appears to have made certain alterations in the liturgy used in Asia Minor, in accordance with the Antiochene rite, and that the Gallican

Liturgy, which was probably derived from Asia Minor, did actually differ from the Antiochene rite in the place so altered, and thence that it might be inferred that a liturgy resembling that of Gaul had formerly prevailed in Asia Minor. The Chevalier observes that this is a conjecture, and cannot be noticed as historical criticism. This is quite true; but the Chevalier's argument does not affect the value of that conjecture, whatever it may be, because Mr. Palmer supposes that the whole East, in A.D. 650, *had* only two classes of liturgies, and if a third had formerly existed at Ephesus, it had been abolished three hundred years before the time of James, Bishop of Edessa.

We are indebted to the Chevalier for a real addition to the existing liturgical documents, in his labours on the Constantinopolitan rites. He thus states the character of those rites, and his own contributions.

"As the Imperial Court took so much care of the Church and the liturgy, from the days of Theodosius down to those of Justinian and Justin, we must not expect to find here a ritual of very high antiquity. The Byzantine ritual marks a new period in liturgical composition, an eclectic refinement upon traditional and provincial forms; in short, what the Roman Liturgy is in the Western Churches.

"Although a certain school in this country seems to despise historical criticism, to such a degree as to disdain even the timid criticism of the Romanist writers of the seventeenth century, and to adopt the exploded errors of Baronius and Bellarmine, I think it unnecessary and unworthy to go back to such elementary discussions, and to prove what requires no proof in the eyes of any scholar; namely, that the two remarkable and world-governing liturgies of St. Basil and St. Chrysostom are *not* the work of these fathers, nor two essentially different forms, but that the one is a slight modification, and on the whole an abridgment of the other. Unfortunately we have as yet no palimpsest manuscript of an early date (fifth or sixth century), which would give us a genuine text, and consequently begin with the Anaphora or the Osculum Pacis. All I have been able to find is an ancient diptych of the end of the eighth century, and therefore nearly contemporary with the Barberini MS. Thus the only documentary form which we can make the basis of our criticism is the text exhibited by the ancient Barberini manuscript. This text is here given for the first time. In order to enable every one to judge of the relation of these two liturgies to each other, their texts have been placed in parallel columns."—
Vol. iv. pp. 185—187.

The great desideratum which the Chevalier has supplied has been the publication of the text of the Liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom from the Barberini manuscript written in the eighth century. This circumstance alone renders the Chevalier's work indispensable to every one who is interested in the critical study of the ancient liturgies. We would notice in passing a remark at

page 195, on the argument of Mr. Palmer for the original identity of the Armenian Liturgy with that of Cæsarea in the time of Basil the Great. The Chevalier appears to us to have misunderstood Mr. Palmer's position, which was *not that the text* of the Armenian Liturgy was derived from Cæsarea, but that its *general order and substance* were. The Chevalier does not deny, as it appears, that the substance of that Armenian Liturgy is faithfully preserved in the Version published by Le Brun; nor does he seem to state more than that the *text* of a Version from the Russian Translation of the Armenian Liturgy does not agree with the *text* of Basil's Liturgy. But he does not enter on the question of conformity of *order*, which was the point aimed at by Mr. Palmer's argument. This is a subject which well deserves examination.

In reference to the Chevalier's essay on the African Liturgies, we have two remarks to offer; first, that he ought not to have introduced as he has, p. 437, a passage from Firmilian as bearing on the African Liturgy, inasmuch as Firmilian lived in Cappadocia, not in Africa, though he addressed the epistle in question to Cyprian; and secondly, that the Chevalier appears to be mistaken in referring the African Liturgy to Alexandria (p. 442), because the only point which is perfectly clear is that they differed with respect to the position of the *Osculum pacis* (compare pp. 442. 325); the African agreeing with the Roman and Milan Liturgy in this point. We therefore infer the greater probability of its agreement with the other Latin Liturgies, than with the Egyptian; as we should also judge from the close connexion between the African and Italian Churches.

The remarks of the author on the Liturgy of Milan, pp. 201, &c., 443, &c., are rather brief; and appear to us by no means to exhaust the subject; but they are interesting and suggestive. The references of St. Ambrose to the Liturgy of his time appear to be passed over without notice. In commenting on the ancient Gallican Liturgy the Chevalier has produced two very valuable and important documents—fragments discovered by Niebuhr and Mone, the former of which is of the date of A.D. 350, and the latter of the early part of the sixth century. We have seen some similar fragments from palimpsests, if we do not mistake, in a volume of the Remains published by Cardinal Angelo Mai; but we are unable at this moment to give a reference to the place. The publication of these ancient remains confers a particular value on the Chevalier's work, in other respects we do not see much that is deserving of especial notice in his remarks on the Gallican and Spanish Liturgies. This part of his work is apparently characterized by less research and labour than his

remarks on the Oriental and Alexandrian Liturgies; and as it enters but little on the field of historical criticism, has added but little to previous knowledge.

But we must speak very differently of his essay on the Roman Liturgy, which, in spite of a credulity in regard to the statements in the *Liber Pontificalis*, that appears perfectly astounding in a man of the Chevalier's critical powers, is replete with able and ingenious conjectural criticism, bearing the appearance of very strong probability.

We cite some of the remarks on the Roman Liturgy:—

“Proceeding to the critical history of this Canon of Gregory the Great, we must first observe, that the present official text, as established after the Council of Trent, differs in some essential points from that exhibited by the ancient MSS. But, if we apply strict historical criticism to the genuine Gregorian text, it is impossible not to see (what some ancient commentators, especially Walafrid, the learned Abbot of Reichenau near Basle, indeed surmised) that it is a patchwork of materials which various circumstances had assisted to throw into great confusion. It is here only necessary to point to the gradual cessation of the regular Oblation of the people before each celebration of the Lord's Supper, and to the introduction of symbolical prayers, intended, not to accompany the real Oblation, but to supply its place, or to the introduction of the earliest form of the Offertory, in the sense of the Medieval Church.

“We believe that from our point of view we are able to solve this enigma more satisfactorily than it has been hitherto done.

“The first startling fact is, that Gregory himself declares, in his letter to the Bishop of Syracuse, of the year 598 (the text is given in the *Reliquiæ*), that when he revised and definitively settled the Consecration Prayer, or the Canon, he ordered the Lord's Prayer to be said immediately after the Ecclesiastical Prayer of Consecration. ‘I did so,’ he says, ‘because it was the custom of the Apostles to consecrate the Sacrifice (hostiam) of Oblation only by that prayer. It appeared to me very strange that we should repeat over the Oblation the prayer which a learned man (scholasticus) had composed, and not repeat over His body and blood the very words delivered to us as composed by our Saviour Himself.’”—Vol. iv. pp. 212, 213.

This circumstance of the Lord's Prayer not being used before Consecration in the ancient Roman Liturgy is most perplexing to the Chevalier, one of whose favourite theories it overthrows; and, to make matters worse, the Abyssinian Liturgy presents the very same feature. But we must proceed with the Chevalier:—

“As the substitution of a set Oblation Prayer for the act of real substantial Oblation must have diminished the transparency of the original service, so another circumstance contributed most particularly

to swell the Consecration Prayers, and to throw the Sacramentaries, or Missals of the Church, into confusion. These were the peculiar prayers inserted from the diptychs, or sacred registers of the names of the benefactors, confessors, and martyrs of the Church. They might be read wherever a peculiar commemoration was appointed of persons, whether living, present, absent, or deceased. Such a commemoration might be inserted immediately after the Oblation and the Preface at the beginning of the Sacrificial Service, or as part of that Consecration Prayer which immediately preceded the Communion, after the words of Institution. What we know positively is, that the commemoration of the living was read by the deacon, out of the diptychs. It was, therefore, originally separate from the prayers offered by the priests; and it was naturally a changeable prayer, and was only to be said when occasion required. How easily might this be mistaken for a part of the fixed prayers of the priest! Such a commemoration of the living was, or might be, according to the vague idea of the Communion of Saints, accompanied with a mention of the triumphant Church of the Apostles, and the Virgin Mary, and other holy men and women in the earlier ages of the Church in general, or of the particular Church in question. In the Roman Canon such a commemoration occurs immediately before the Lord's Prayer: '*Memento etiam Domine,*' &c. This furnishes primitive proof of its being an undue insertion in the ordinary Communion Service, and of its having been introduced into it (by a mere misunderstanding, I suppose) from the *Missa pro Defunctis*. It is not found in the Gelasian Sacramentary: and a very ancient Gregorian Sacramentary, quoted very conclusively for that purpose by Daniel, states expressly that it was destined for the *Missa pro Defunctis*. Now if this prayer be extraneous to the original ordinary services, that which follows, '*Nobis quoque precatoribus,*' must necessarily also be eliminated, because it is in fact nothing but its second part.

" But the mention of the Apostles and martyrs and other saints in the former part of the service, or in the Oblation Prayer beginning with the word '*Communicantes,*' appears to belong originally to the general text.

" Now as to the first word of this celebrated prayer, '*Communicantes,*' nobody has ever been able to construe it. Absolutely, as it stands, it can mean nothing but the '*Communicants,*' which gives no sense. Neither sense nor grammar admits of its being construed with the following genitives. But if we consider that the preceding prayer, '*Memento, Domine, famularum,*' in its original text, is the deacon's prayer, which became obsolete when the real Offering of the People ceased, except in some few instances (and this was the case already in the sixth century at the latest), the prayer '*Communicantes*' manifestly follows the last words of the first prayer of the Canon, '*Te, igitur, clementissime Pater,*' which makes the construction and sense correct and satisfactory.

" This first prayer is followed by two short prayers, of which the one

begins, '*Hanc igitur oblationem*,' the other, '*Quam oblationem*.' The beginning of the first is evidently the conclusion of the Oblation Prayer, supplicating God to accept this oblation of His servants and children; the second ends with introducing the words of Institution, '*Qui pridie*.' Now we know that St. Gregory amplified the first. John the Deacon, his biographer, says he added the words, '*diesque nostras in tuâ pace disponas*;' which Cardinal Bona understands (naturally) as implying that the remaining words of this prayer,

" 'Atque ab æternâ damnatione nos eripi et in electorum tuorum numero jubeas nos numerari,'

were also added by Gregory.

" But, if we adopt this view, it is clear that the preceding words of the prayer which Gregory found,

" 'Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ sed et cunctæ familiæ tuæ quæsumus Domine ut placatus accipias,'

did not constitute a prayer by themselves, but were only the beginning of a prayer. And, indeed, the next prayer opens rather awkwardly at present, by referring to the first words of the preceding one: '*Quam oblationem tu Deus in omnibus quæsumus*.' The original form, therefore, must have been this:

" 'Hanc igitur oblationem servitutis nostræ sed et cunctæ familiæ tuæ quæsumus ut placatus accipias; atque in omnibus benedictam adscriptam ratam rationabilem acceptabilemque facere digneris, ut nobis Corpus et Sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Qui pridie,' " &c.—Vol. iv. pp. 214—218.

The Chevalier afterwards represents the text of the Roman canon of the Mass at different dates, according to the principles laid down; and we think he has been most successful in this part of his work; and has given us the text of that liturgy as extant in the fourth century.

In concluding our notice of the liturgical labours of Chevalier Bunsen, we most gladly bear witness to the learning, ingenuity, and research which characterize them throughout, and to the candid and enlightened spirit of criticism in which they have been prosecuted. We would express, on the whole, an opinion that he has considerably enlarged the existing amount of liturgical knowledge; that he has made several very excellent and ingenious conjectures; and that his work, though very far from exhausting its subject, or superseding the necessity for further critical research, is of great and substantial merit, and is indispensable to the student of liturgies. We can excuse a little German theorizing which peeps out now and then, in consideration of the solid results which he has placed before us.

ART. II.—*Sermons on National Subjects, preached in a Village Church.* By CHARLES KINGSLEY, Canon of Middleham, Yorkshire, and Rector of Eversley, Hants. London: John J. Griffin. Glasgow: Richard Griffin and Co. 1852.

THE name of Charles Kingsley is already known to the readers of the "English Review," as the author of a very beautiful poem, which we had the very great pleasure of bringing before them some time since; and which has, we rejoice to see, just reached a second edition. He is known too elsewhere, as the author of a very valuable volume of twenty-five Village Sermons, in which, though there are some blemishes, there is more force and godliness than in any collection of the kind that has appeared in the present century, always, of course, excepting the discourses of the Vicar of Leeds, who stands above and alone—

"*Inter minora sidera.*"

But Mr. Kingsley has earned himself a world-wide reputation, by other writings than those above mentioned—ay, and by spoken words and acted deeds too. Full of genuine and intense love toward God and man, and keenly conscious of the social and physical evils of the present day, he has come forward as a root and branch reformer of current opinions and social institutions, under the name of a CHRISTIAN SOCIALIST.

The name has something about it decidedly *bizarre*. It strikes one as at least odd, to say the least of it, that a *Christian* should adopt the name of *Socialist* as his *substantive* appellation. The compound thus produced being apparently equivalent, in scientific phrase, to the formula *genus, socialist—species, Christian*. We think the name thus produced—the combination of words thus employed—utterly indefensible; and we have a peculiar right to judge Mr. Kingsley very strictly in this matter, for he has said, and we cordially agree with him in the sentiment:—

"You may think there is a difference, or that it is but a difference of words. I tell you that a difference in words is a very awful important difference. A difference in words is a difference in things. Words are very awful and wonderful things, for they come from the most awful and wonderful of all beings, Jesus Christ, the Word. He put words into men's minds. He made all things, and He makes all words to express those things with. *And woe to those who use the wrong*

words about things! If a man calls any thing by a wrong name, it is a sure sign that he understands that thing wrongly, or feels about it wrongly; and therefore a man's words are often *honester* than he thinks; for as a man's words are, so is a man's heart; out of the abundance of our hearts our mouths speak; and therefore by right words, by the right names that we call things, we shall be justified, and by our words, by the wrong names that we call things, we shall be condemned."

Judged by his own statement—a statement, forming a portion of a sermon on "Religion not Godliness," a sermon which ought to be printed in letters of gold, and circulated gratuitously through the land, especially amongst Evangelicals and Romanizers, Mr. Kingsley is found guilty of a grievous sin, or a grievous mistake;—a grievous sin if he means what he says, a grievous mistake if he does not. He is in fact placed in the same dilemma as those men who apply the word *propitiatory* to the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist; if they mean what they say, they are chargeable with pernicious error; if they do not, with grave indiscretion; if neither he nor they mean to propagate false and mischievous tenets and to promote wicked practices, they have no right to find fault with others for suspecting them of such views and intentions. Nay, more, granting for the sake of argument, that neither class intend to teach what is wrong; they, by the use of such phrases, accustom the minds of their followers to view with less abhorrence the falsehoods whose symbols they have adopted as the representatives of the truths which they teach; they throw down the barriers which nature or art have erected for the protection of mankind, and clear the way for an incoming deluge of abomination.

The words Christian and Socialist are in themselves utterly irreconcilable; "*For what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? And what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?*" OR WHAT PART HATH HE THAT BELIEVETH WITH AN INFIDEL!"

Leaving Mr. Kingsley to answer these plain questions at his leisure, we proceed to a consideration of the Sermons under review.

Let us begin with the title. They are in the first place Sermons on *National Subjects*; they are therefore intended for the instruction of the nation—ourselves amongst the number—and are open to free and rigid discussion. They convey, it is to be presumed, the opinions of the author, a leading Christian Socialist, as to the measures to be adopted for meeting or avoiding the crisis which every man who has eyes must see is approaching with daily increasing rapidity.

They are also sermons preached in a village church, and con-

sequently to a village congregation; and they are therefore deliberately put forth as a sample of the style of preaching and teaching, which Mr. Kingsley and his friends consider as suitable for such a purpose.

We beg our readers carefully to remember these two facts whilst they go along with us, as in no unkind spirit we endeavour to survey the series of discourses now lying before us—feeling as we sincerely feel, that if their author be in many points essentially wrong, he is on many points essentially right, and that in many others, and those the points on which an outcry is raised against him, his errors, arise from the misapprehension of important and fundamental truths, which have been practically ignored so long that they who seek to revive them are in danger of mistaking the counterfeit for the reality, and of furnishing to the hungry who hunger after truth and righteousness, the apples of Sodom and grapes of Gomorrah, instead of the blessed fruit of the Tree of Eternal Life.

That Mr. Kingsley and his friends should have been attacked and reviled as they have been, by those who look upon any interference with the rules and principles of the world—the world that lieth in wickedness, the world that is at enmity with God—as an act of hostility against themselves, of rebellion against *their* God, is natural and “proper;” but just as in the case of any other excellent but erring individual, it would be equally wrong to join in the cry raised against them, by those who hate all that is holy and good, or to withhold the censure which they deserve when and where that censure ought to fall.

Let us begin with the first of the series, a noble sermon, entitled *THE KING OF THE EARTH*, and preached on the first Sunday in Advent. It commences thus:—

“This Sunday is the first of the four Sundays in Advent. During those four Sundays our forefathers have advised us to think seriously of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ—not that we should neglect to think of it at all times. As some of you know, I have preached to you about it often lately. Perhaps before the end of Advent, you will all of you, more or less, understand what all I have said about the cholera, and public distress, and the sins of this nation, and the sins of the labouring people has to do with the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. But I intend, especially in my next four sermons, to speak my whole mind to you about this matter, as far as God has shown it to me; taking the collect, epistle, and gospel for each Sunday in Advent, and explaining them. I am sure I cannot do better; for the more I see of those collects, epistles, and gospels, and the way which they are arranged, the more I am astonished and delighted at the wisdom with which they are

chosen, the wise order in which they follow each other, and fit into each other."—pp. 1, 2.

So far, so good. Mr. Kingsley believes, as he tells us here and elsewhere, that his principles are in accordance with the letter and spirit of Scripture, and of that Church of which he is a priest. Such too is the profession, the sincere profession of others with whom we have the misfortune to differ. We indeed may see incongruity and inconsistency in their system; but as long as they bow implicitly to the Written Word, and avow an undeviating loyalty to our Church, we are bound to give them the full credit due to such professions, however mistaken they may be. So also with Mr. Kingsley—he may be, nay, he undoubtedly is, in grave error upon certain points; but whereas he holds them sincerely and openly, and honestly believes them to be consistent with the Bible and the Prayer Book; we should endeavour to point out his mistakes to him in a spirit of love, a spirit far different from that in which we should deal with a Pyrrhonist or a Romanizer.

"Now do not be in a hurry," proceeds he, after some striking observations, "and fancy from what I have just said, that I am one of those who think the end of the world is at hand. It may be for aught I know. 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, not even the angels of God, nor the Son, but the Father only.' If you wish for my own opinion, I believe that what people commonly call the end of the world, that is, the end of the earth and of mankind on it, is not at hand at all. As far as I can judge from Scripture, and from the history of all nations, the earth is yet young, and mankind in its infancy. Five thousand years hence, our descendants may be looking back on us as foolish barbarians, in comparison with what they know; just as we look back upon the ignorance of people a thousand years ago. And yet I believe that the end of this world, in the real Scripture sense of the word 'world,' is coming very quickly and very truly. The end of this system of society, of these present ways in religion, and money-making, and conducting ourselves in all the affairs of life, which we English people have got into now-a-days. The end of it is coming. It cannot last much longer; for it is destroying itself. It will not last much longer; for Christ and not the devil is the king of the earth. As St. Paul said to his people, so say I to you, 'The night is far spent, the day is at hand.'

"These may seem strange words, but almost every one is saying them, in his own way. One large party among religious people in these days, is complaining that Christ has left his Church, and that the cause of Christianity will be ruined and lost, unless some great change takes place. Another large party of religious people say, that the prophecies are on the point of being all fulfilled; that the 1260 days, spoken of

by the prophet Daniel, are just coming to an end; and that Christ is coming with his saints, to reign openly upon earth for a thousand years. The wisest philosophers and historians of late years, have been all foretelling a great and tremendous change in England, and throughout all Europe; and in the mean time, manufacturers and landlords, tradesmen and farmers, artisans and labourers, all say, that there *must* be a change, and will be a change—that people cannot live if things go on much longer as they are. I believe they are all right, every one of them. They put it in their words; I think it better to put it in the Scripture words, and say boldly, ‘Jesus Christ, the King of the earth is coming.’

“But you will ask, ‘What right have you to stand up and say any thing so surprising?’ My friends, the world is full of surprising things, and this age above all ages. It was not sixty years ago, that a nobleman was laughed at in the House of Lords, for saying that he believed that we should one day see ships go by steam; and now there are steamers on every sea and ocean in the world. Who expected twenty years ago, to see the whole face of England covered with these wonderful railroads? Who expected on the 22nd of February last year, that, within a single month, half the nations of Europe, which looked so quiet and secure, would be shaken from top to bottom with revolutions and bloodshed—kings and princes vanishing one after the other like a dream—poor men sitting for a day as rulers of kingdoms, and then hurled down again to make room for other rulers as unexpected as themselves? Can any one consider the last fifty years—can any one consider that one last year, 1848, and then not feel that we do live in a most strange and awful time? a time for which nothing is too surprising, a time in which we all ought to be prepared, from the least to the greatest, to see the greatest horrors and the greatest blessings come suddenly upon us, like a thief in the night? So much for Christ’s coming being too wonderful a thing to happen just now. Still you are right to ask, ‘What do you mean by Christ being our King? What do you mean by his coming to us? What reason have you for supposing that He is coming *now*, rather than at any other time? And if He be coming, what are we to do? What is there we ought to repent of? What is there we ought to amend.’”—pp. 3—6.

There is of course much of truth in all this. We indeed think that the personal advent of our Lord is much nearer at hand than Mr. Kingsley does; still it is an open question, upon which each man has a right to form his own judgment. But that a great and an important crisis in the history of England is approaching, we hold it weaker than folly and worse than madness to doubt.

Mr. Kingsley goes on to say:—

“Well, my friends—it is just these questions which I hope and trust God will enable me to answer to you, in my next few sermons—I am

perfectly convinced that if we go on as nineteen-twentieths are doing in England now, the Lord of us all will come in an hour, when we are not aware, and cut us asunder *in the deepest and most real sense*, as He came and cut asunder France, Germany, and Austria, only last year, and appoint us our portion with the unbelievers. And I believe that our punishment will be seven times as severe as that of either France, Germany, or Austria, because we have had seven times their privileges and blessings, seven times their Gospel light and Christian knowledge, seven times their freedom and justice in laws and constitution, seven times their wealth and prosperity, and means of employing our population. Much has been given to England, and of her much will be required."—p. 4.

Now, whilst agreeing in the main with all this, we must protest against the passage which we have marked in italics: the temporal punishments of God are not the deepest and most real fulfilment of his vengeance against sinners; the keenest, sternest of them, are but nothing in comparison with the worm that dieth not, and the fire that never is quenched. But to deal with the general subject, that a crisis is coming, and that we must look it boldly in the face, and *act* as well as *speculate*, we have no manner of doubt; and in certain great principles and views, which Mr. Kingsley lays down as determining the character of our measures, and the spirit in which they are to be undertaken and carried out, we cordially agree; though we hold that his opinions upon many points are crude and vague, as though he had not mastered his subject; on others, partial and one-sided; and on others, erroneous and dangerous.

The universal kingship of Christ—the personal and practical omnipresence of God—the constant need and omnific efficacy of the Holy Spirit—the absolute necessity and solemn obligation under which we lie politically and morally, to realize in every-day life the brotherhood of baptism and the membership of Christ—the impiety as well as impolicy of mammon-worship in all its forms and under all its phases—the erroneous and anti-scriptural character of the views which the rich too frequently entertain of their own responsibilities and relative duties, as well as of the condition of the poor in God's sight—all these are mighty master-truths which Mr. Kingsley nobly and boldly lays down, and without which they who would reconstruct the tottering edifice of social life will meet with a fate resembling that of him who built his house upon the sand.

We shall notice the crudities, partialities, and errors of our author as they come under our notice. Let us however proceed

with a more grateful task, and quote *in extenso* what he has said regarding the kingship of Christ:—

“ I dare say there are some among you who are inclined to think that when we talk of Christ being a king, that the word king means something very different from its common meaning; and, God knows, that that is true enough. Our blessed Lord took care to make people understand that—how He was not like one of the kings of the nations, how his kingdom was not of this world. But yet the Bible tells us again and again that all good kings, all real kings, are patterns of Christ; and, therefore, that when we talk of Christ being a king, we mean that He is a king in every thing that a king ought to be, that He fulfils perfectly all the duties of a king; that He is the pattern which all kings ought to copy. Kings have been in all ages too apt to forget that, and, indeed, so have the people too. We, English, have forgotten most thoroughly in these days, that Christ is our king, or even a king at all. We talk of Christ being a ‘spiritual’ king, and then we say that that merely means that He is king of Christians’ hearts. And when any one asks what that means, it comes out, that all we mean is, that Christ has a very great influence over the hearts of believing Christians, when He can obtain it; or else that it means that He is king of a very small number of people called the elect, whom He has chosen out, but that He has absolutely nothing to do with the whole rest of the world. And then, when any one stands up with the Bible in his hand, and says, in the plain words of Scripture, ‘Christ is not only the king of believers, He is the king of the whole earth; the king of the clouds and the thunder, the king of the land and the cattle, and the trees, and the corn, and to whomsoever He will He giveth them. Christ is not only the king of believers—He is the king of all—the king of the wicked, of the heathen, of those who do not believe Him, who never heard of Him. Christ is not only the king of a few individual persons, one here and one there in every parish, but He is the king of every nation. He is the king of England, by the grace of God, just as much as Queen Victoria is, and ten thousand times more.’ If any man talks in this way, people stare—think him an enthusiast—ask him what new doctrine this is, and call his words unscriptural, just because they come out of Scripture and not out of man’s perversions and twistings of Scripture. Nevertheless Christ is King; really and truly King of kings and Lord of lords; and He will make men know it. What He was, that He is and ever will be; there is no change in Him; his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion endureth throughout all ages, and woe unto those, small and great, who rebel against Him!

“ But what sort of a king is He? He is a king of law, and order, and justice. He is not selfish, fanciful, self-willed. He said Himself that He came not to do his own will but his Father’s. He is a king of gentleness and meekness too: but do not mistake that. There is no

weak indulgence in Him. A man may be very meek, and yet stern enough and strong enough."—pp. 7—9.

After illustrating this by the character and conduct of Moses, Mr. Kingsley proceeds:—

"And such a one is our King, my friends; Jesus Christ the Son of God. Like Moses, says St. Paul, He is faithful in his office. Therefore He is severe as well as gentle."—p. 10.

Thus far nothing can be better—the principles are just; the statements true; the manner bold; the style simple, straightforward, and impressive. But here we must diverge from Mr. Kingsley, because he diverges from the truth as it is in Jesus; that is to say, he gives such a purely one-sided view of the case as to be practically false and mischievous. He is preaching his first Advent sermon, which is, as it were, his preface and introduction to his Advent course and his national volume; we should therefore expect some definite answer, some adumbration of an answer to the questions already propounded, "*What is there we ought to repent of? What is there we ought to amend?*" We should expect some catalogue of those thoughts and deeds and words, those modes of feeling and habits of action upon which the severity of our King will be exercised. In these matters, however, Mr. Kingsley is strangely defective and particoloured, and the defectiveness and partiality of his teaching will appear, whether we test it by the statements of Scripture—especially those referring to the latter days—or by the verification of those statements which is furnished by the facts of the present time.

We are told for example in Holy Writ that "in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, *boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient unto parents, unthankful, unholy without natural affection, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof;*"—that "neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers shall enter the kingdom of God."

We see around us a great deal of boastfulness, and pride, and blasphemy, and disobedience to parents; we see a great and rapid decay of *natural affection*; we perceive much contempt for those that are good, much treason, headiness, and highmindedness; a great tendency to follow interest or pleasure rather than

duty—to sacrifice TO ΚΑΛΟΝ to TO ΗΔΥ or TO ΣΥΜΦΕΡΟΝ—we are painfully aware of the fact that within the present century fornication has greatly increased amongst the poorer classes; whilst of late years idolatry has made great progress amongst the more highly educated; and we presume that little proof is required to show the extent to which reviling, drunkenness, and dishonesty prevail in many parts both of town and country.

We should therefore have naturally expected some allusion to these things. It is difficult to believe, though we should be delighted to find ourselves mistaken, that Mr. Kingsley's village flock is totally exempt from any of them; be this however as it may, that large body which he addresses through the press—the English nation—is undoubtedly guilty of them to a very vast extent. And Mr. Kingsley is therefore deserving of grave censure for omitting all, even the most distant allusion to them in the peroration to his opening discourse.

Now, do not let Mr. Kingsley and his friends mistake us—we abhor as much as he or they do the notion that would sink the Church into a moral police, organized by the Few for the purpose of subjecting the Many to their will, rendering them subservient to their whim and wish, pleasure and profit—we are quite as anxious as the most rabid Christian Socialist for the moral and social elevation of the masses, and we look upon it as a part, and a very important part too, of the Church's mission, to plead the cause of the widow and the fatherless, to let the oppressed go free and to break every yoke; still we protest in the strongest terms of which our language is capable, against the one-sided teaching which would represent sin as confined to the rich and the powerful; or salvation as assured to the poor and the feeble. We would urge upon Mr. Kingsley and others who preach in this strain the awful fact, that if through their defective teaching, any of those poor and needy members of Christ's body in whom they take (and we sincerely honour them for taking) so deep an interest should perish everlastingly, his blood will be upon the head of him who neglected to declare to him the *full* message of God. Scripture has spoken unmistakeably upon this point:—

“I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel, therefore thou shalt hear the word from My mouth and warn them from Me. When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, *that wicked man shall die in his iniquity*; BUT HIS BLOOD WILL I REQUIRE AT THINE HAND.”

Let us then see what Mr. Kingsley has said, that our readers

may be able to judge for themselves as to the accuracy of our charge:—

“With the poor, with the outcast, the neglected, those on whom men trampled, who was gentler than the Lord Jesus? To the proud pharisee, the canting scribe, the cunning Herodian, who was sterner than the Lord Jesus? Read that awful 23rd chapter of St. Matthew, and then see how the Saviour, the lamb dumb before his shearers, He of whom it was said ‘He shall not strive nor cry, nor shall his voice be heard in the streets’—how He could speak when He had occasion—‘Woe unto you scribes and pharisees, hypocrites!’ ‘Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?’

“My friends, these were the words of our King, of Him in whom was neither passion nor selfishness, who loved us even to the death, and endured for us the scourge, the cross, the grave. And, believe me, such are his words now; though we do not hear Him, the heaven and the earth hear Him, and obey Him. His message is pardon, mercy, deliverance to the sorrowful and the oppressed, and the neglected; and to the proud, the tyrannical, the self-righteous, the hypocritical, tribulation and anguish, shame and woe.

“Because He is the Saviour, therefore He is a consuming fire to all who try to hinder Him from saving men. Because He is the Son of God, He will sweep out of his Father’s kingdom all who offend, and whosoever maketh and loveth a lie. Because He is boundless mercy and love, therefore He will show no mercy to those who try to stop his purposes of love. Because He is the King of men, the enemies of mankind are his enemies; and He will reign till He has put them all under his feet.”—p. 11.

All this is of course very right and true as far as it goes; but then it does not go far enough. It is the truth, but not the *whole truth*; and we need scarcely remark, that whether in the pulpit or the witness-box, the *suppressio veri* is quite as dangerous as the *assertio falsi*. To take an illustration from the former: the preacher who inculcates either justification by faith, or judgment according to works, without the other, may disseminate the most deadly and anti-Christian and soul-destroying error, without making one single statement that is contrary to the teaching of either the Bible or the Church.

We have lingered long upon this opening discourse, not from any inherent pre-excellence, but because it may fairly be taken as a sample and an index of the rest.

We proceed to consider the second sermon, entitled *Holy Scripture*.—The greater part of this discourse is exceedingly beautiful, and calculated to benefit all, of whatever rank or class, who hear or read it, by arousing in their hearts and minds a fuller, deeper appreciation of those oracles of God, which still pour

forth their mighty, their eternal voice, unchanged and unchangeable, amid the changes and chances of this mortal life—the contests of nations—the quarrels of Churches—the rise and fall of heresies and schisms—the wide and incalculable revolutions in political institutions, social and domestic relations, and public opinion, accompanying the imperceptible but unceasing lapse of created ages—those oracles of God which speak to us directly of Him and from Him who is mirrored in their pages, which ever furnish the ready solution of all things necessary to salvation to him who asks of them humbly and prayerfully in spirit and in truth. Take the following:—

“All these ancient psalms and prophets, and histories of men and nations who trusted in God ‘were written for our example, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope.’

“Yes, my friends, this is true; and the longer you live a life of faith and godliness, the longer you read and study that precious Book of books which God has put so freely into your hands in these days, the more you will find it. And if it was true of the Old Testament, written before the Lord came down and dwelt among men, how much more must it be true of the New Testament, which was written, after his coming, by apostles and evangelists, who had far fuller light and knowledge of the Lord than ever David or the old prophets, even in their happiest moments, had? Ah, what a treasure you have, every one of you, in those Bibles of yours, which too many of you read so little! From the first chapter of Genesis to the last of Revelation, it is all written for our example, all profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for all good works. Ah! friends, friends, is not this the reason why so many of you do not read your Bibles, that you do not wish to be furnished for good works?—do not wish to be men of God, godly and godlike men, but only to be men of the world, caring only for money and pleasure?—some of you, alas! not wishing to be men and women at all, but only a sort of brute beasts with clothes on, given up to filth and folly, like the animals that perish, or rather worse than the animals, for they could be no better if they tried, but you might be. Oh! what might you not be, what are you not already, if you but knew it! Members of Christ, children of God, heirs of the kingdom of heaven, heirs of a hope undying, pure, that will never fade away, having a right given you by the promise and oath of Almighty God himself, to hope for yourselves, for your neighbours, for this poor distracted world, for ever and ever; a right to believe that there is an everlasting day of justice, and peace, and happiness in store for the whole world, and that you, if you will, may have your share in that glorious sunrise which shall never set again. You may have your share in it, each and every one of you; and if you ask why, go to the Scriptures, and there read the promises of God, the grounds of your just hope, for all heaven and earth.”—pp. 13—15.

There is indeed in this sermon here and there a somewhat peculiar and suspicious phrase or expression, yet there is nothing which *may* not bear a good meaning, and much that *must* do so. We must except, however, from this eulogy the following passage, which, beautiful though it be, has a tendency to divert the mind from the primary meaning of one of the many important texts which assert the essential doctrine of the Atonement :—

“ ‘Behold the Lamb of God,’ said John the Baptist, ‘who takes away the sin of the world.’ How dare we, who call ourselves Christians, we who have been baptized in his name, we who have tasted of his mercy, we who know the might of his love, the converting and renewing power of his Spirit—how dare we doubt but that He *will* take away the sins of the world? Ay, step by step, nation by nation, year by year, the Lord shall conquer; love and justice and wisdom shall spread and grow, for He must reign till He has put all enemies under his feet. He has promised to take away the sins of the world, and He is God and cannot lie.”—p. 18.

Now we earnestly protest against what we cannot call by any milder name than a manifest and dangerous perversion of the plain meaning of God's Word.

Mr. Kingsley's notions, however, on the interpretation of Scripture, appear to be exceedingly vague and crude. We trust that a little careful consideration will make him see their untenableness and deficiency. Take for example the following extraordinary passage from the third sermon, entitled “The Kingdom of God,”—a sermon the greater part of which is occupied with exhibiting in the most masterly manner the reality of God's providential government, and the merciful majesty of Christ :—

“ No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation, says St. Peter. That is, it does not apply to any one private, particular thing that is to happen. Every prophecy of Scripture goes on fulfilling itself more and more, as time rolls on and the world grows older. St. Peter tells us the reason why. No prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation, because it does not come from the will of man, from any invention or discovery of poor, short-sighted human beings, who can only judge by what they see around them in their own times; but holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. And who is the Holy Spirit? The Spirit of God; the everlasting Spirit; the Spirit who cannot change, for He is God. The Spirit who searcheth the deep things of God, and teacheth them to men. And what are the deep things of God. They are eternal, as God is. Eternal laws, everlasting rules, which cannot alter. That is the meaning of it all. The Spirit of God is the Spirit which teaches men the laws of God; the unchangeable rules and ordinances by which He governs all

heaven and earth, and men, and nations; the laws which come into force, not once only, but always; the laws of God, which are working round us now, just as much as they were eighteen hundred years ago, just as much as they were in Isaiah's time. Therefore it is that I said these old Jewish prophecies, which were inspired by the Holy Spirit, are coming true now, and will keep on coming true, time after time, in their proper place and order, and whensoever the times are fit for them, even to the end of the world."—p. 26.

Now the meaning of all this appears to be, that each prophecy of Scripture is merely the *concrete enunciation of an abstract law*. It is painful to find such vagueness and crudity of thought and word upon so very important a point in one who has such a sincere love both to God and man, and such a reverent appreciation of God's Book, as the author of this volume evinces from first to last. It is painful, not merely or so much either on the author's own account, or on that of those subjected to his pastoral charge, as for the sake of those who, in the natural course of things, will be his theological apprentices, his exegetical pupils—trained under his teaching to teach others. Pietism may stand its ground for *one generation* in the pastor—for two, or, under peculiar circumstances, perhaps three in the flock; but a pietist school of teaching, whatever be the zeal, and love, and sincerity, and piety of its founders, must inevitably lapse into rationalism. Look at Germany! We might find a case nearer home; but we refrain, from a tender respect to the saintly though erring departed.

We therefore earnestly and sternly, yet in a spirit of yearning love—for we cannot read any thing that Mr. Kingsley has written without loving him—we do entreat him to consider well before he commits himself irretrievably—through what we would fain hope is at present a mere vague habit of thought—to principles which contain the germ of every thing that is impious, heretical, and damnable.

We are happy to be able to bestow unlimited commendation on the two next discourses, entitled *A Preparation for Christmas*, and *Christmas Day*: we think that Mr. Kingsley would confer a solid benefit on the labouring classes, and indeed on all classes of the community, by publishing them in a cheap form for distribution; their devout yet cheerful spirit is truly delightful, and though full of holy rejoicing, there is a pathetic simplicity about them which brings the tears to our eyes; and if this be the case with such an iron being as a reviewer, a mere machine, a species of automatic guillotine—of self-acting rack—what must be their effect on less indurated natures? These two sermons are indeed almost beyond praise; and as we cannot fairly quote them except *in extenso*, we shall simply proceed on our way.

The sixth discourse, "True Abstinence," contains much that is valuable; urges the universal obligation which all Christians are under, especially the young of both sexes, to abstain from sins of the flesh, and exposes with great skill the fundamental mistake of asceticism.

One of the most striking and powerful sermons in the book is that on Good Friday; though this and the one which immediately follows it, viz.—Easter Day, are the most thoroughly objectionable.

We must bestow some space upon them, which we are the more sorry for, as it will hinder us from dwelling at as great length as we could wish on the later portions of this very interesting volume.

"On this very day, at this very hour," commences the preacher, "1817 years ago, hung one nailed to a cross; bruised and bleeding, pierced and naked, dying a felon's death between two thieves; in perfect misery, in utter shame, mocked and insulted by all the great, the rich, the learned of his nation; one who had grown up as a man of low birth, believed by all to be a carpenter's son; without scholarship, money, respectability, even without a home wherein to lay his head: and here was the end of his life! True, He had preached noble words, He had done noble deeds; but what had they helped Him? They had not made the rich, the learned, the respectable, the religious, believe on Him; they had not saved Him from persecution, and insult, and death."—p. 74.

Thus far nothing can be nobler; and the fearful warning to the professors of religion and respectability which these words convey, we commend to all those who attempt to explain away the awful text: "*It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.* WITH MEN THIS IS IMPOSSIBLE." It would seem, however, that Mr. Kingsley had altogether forgotten that our Lord added, "BUT NOT WITH GOD, FOR WITH GOD ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE." For he adds, and he adds nothing more:—

"The only mourners who stood by to weep over his dying agonies were his mother a poor countrywoman; a young fisherman; and one who had been a harlot and a sinner. There was an end!"—p. 75.

Now this is very fine, and (as we said before), as far as it goes, very true. But then the impression conveyed by it is utterly false.

When one working man had betrayed Him for gold, incensed by being frustrated in an attempt to embezzle the funds of a charity, when one poor fisherman had three times denied that he knew Him, and the rest of his followers had forsaken Him and

fled, leaving none of the male sex amongst those of his own condition faithful to Him save his one bosom friend ; when Scribe and Pharisee, and Sadducee and Herodian were thirsting for his blood ; and the awful tribunal of the lordly and sacred Sanhedrim, at once the supreme legislative assembly and judicial court in all matters, civil as well as ecclesiastical, was convened to find Him guilty ; when the base-hearted retainers of the merciless and tyrannical hypocrite, who was invested with the high priest's office, were loading Him with insult and barbarity ; they were two peers of the realm—men of the highest wealth, and rank, and power—members of the exclusive Few, who stood forward to vindicate the cause of justice and humanity ! Yes, it was Nicodemus, the wealthy and the wise ; and the affluent Joseph of Arimathea who dared defy the unanimous Sanhedrim in the very moment of its malignant triumph, and boldly assert the innocence of the doomed Jesus of Nazareth !

Again ; after the turbulent and truculent rabble which desired but a few days since to proclaim Him their King, had called for and obtained His death ; after His followers—the poor and the unlearned amongst them at least—had utterly given up all hope whatever, with the mournful observation, “ We thought that this had been He which should have redeemed Israel,” those two brave noblemen went boldly to Pilate and craved the body of Jesus, and gave it burial ! Surely Mr. Kingsley must know these things, and, knowing them, he ought not to keep them back, especially when he is addressing a village congregation, and attempting to teach a nation, on national subjects.

The author proceeds, however, in a strain of simple sublimity, and stern earnestness seldom surpassed :—

“ Do you know who that man was ? He was your King ; the King of rich and poor ; and He was your King, not in spite of his suffering all that shame and misery, but just because He suffered it ; because He chose to be poor, and miserable, and despised ; because He endured the cross, despising the shame ; because He took upon Himself, to fulfil his Father's will, all ills which flesh is heir to—therefore He is now your King, the Saviour of the world, the poor man's friend, the Lord of heaven and earth. Is He such a King as *you* wish for ?

“ Is He the sort of King you want, my friends ? Does He fulfil your notions of what the poor man's friend should be ? Do you in your hearts wish He had been somewhat richer, more glorious, more successful in the world's eyes—a wealthy and prosperous man, like Solomon of old ? Are any of you ready to say, as the money-blinded Jews said, when they demanded their true King to be crucified, ‘ We have no king but Cæsar ? Provided the law-makers and the authorities take care of our interests, and protect our property, and do not make

us pay too many rates and taxes, that is enough for us?' Will you have no king but Cæsar? Alas! those who say that, find that the law is but a weak deliverer, too weak to protect them from selfishness, and covetousness, and decent cruelty; and so Cæsar and the law have to give place to Mammon, the god of money. Do we not see it in these very days? And Mammon is weak too. This world is not a shop, men are not merely money-makers and wages-earners. There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in that sort of philosophy. Self-interest and covetousness cannot keep society orderly and peaceful, let sham philosophers say what they will. And then comes tyranny, lawlessness, rich and poor staining their hands in each other's blood, as we saw happen in France two years ago; and so, after all, Mammon has to give place to Moloch, the fiend of murder and cruelty; and woe to rich and poor when he reigns over them! Ay, woe—woe to rich and poor, when they choose any one for their king, but their real and rightful Lord and Master, Jesus, the poor Man, afflicted in all their afflictions, the Man of sorrows crucified on this day."—p. 76.

The heart-stirring eloquence of this passage must compel the admiration of the most unwilling; the denunciations which it contains of the present; the warnings which it utters for the future are worthy of the highest praise. The next two paragraphs are absolutely magnificent, though they close with the following rather startling statement:—

"His tenderness is Almighty, and for the poor He has prepared deliverance, perhaps in this world, *surely in the world to come*—boundless deliverance, out of the treasures of his boundless love."—p. 77.

In the same strain he proceeds to say—

"Believing in Jesus, we can pass by mines, and factories, and by dungeons darker and fouler still, in the lanes and alleys of our great towns and cities, where thousands and tens of thousands of starving men, and even women, and children grown old before their youth, sit toiling and pining in Mammon's prison-house, in worse than Egyptian bondage, to earn such pay as just keeps the broken heart within the worn-out body;—ay, we can go through our great cities, even now, and see the women whom God intended to be Christian wives and mothers, the slaves of the rich man's greed by day, the playthings of his lust by night; and yet not despair: for we can cry, No! thou proud Mammon, money-making fiend! these are not thine, but Christ's; they belong to Him who died on the cross; and though thou heedest not their sighs, He marks them all, for He has sighed like them; though there be no pity in thee, there is in Him the pity of a man, ay, and the indignation of a God! He treasures up their tears; He understands their sorrows; his judgment of their guilt is not like thine, thou pharisee! He is their Lord, who said, that to those to whom little was given, of them shall little be required. Generation after generation, they are

being made perfect by sufferings, as their Saviour was before them ; and then woe to thee ! For even as He led Israel out of Egypt with a mighty hand, and a stretched-out arm, and signs and wonders great and terrible, so shall He lead the poor out of this misery, and make them households like a flock of sheep ; even as He led Israel through the wilderness, tender, forbearing, knowing whereof they were made, having mercy on all their brutalities, and idolatries, murmurings, and backslidings, afflicted in all their afflictions : even while He was punishing them outwardly, as He is punishing the poor man now ; even so shall He lead this people out in his good time, into a good land and large, a land of wheat and wine, of milk and honey ; a rest which He has prepared for his poor, such as eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive. He can do it ; for the Almighty Deliverer is his name. He will do it ; for his name is Love. He knows how to do it ; for He has borne the griefs, and carried the sorrows of the poor.”—p. 79.

It is really distressing to see a man of good feelings and good intentions allowing himself to be so utterly carried away by his kindly emotions, to become so utterly the creature of impulse, as to write and preach and publish such a mischievous rhapsody as that which we have just transcribed ; and the brilliant eloquence of the passage makes it only the more blameworthy. Mr. Kingsley is jealous, and rightly jealous for the worship of the One God ; he is anxious and rightly anxious to warn us against substituting religion for godliness. Will he bear with us—we trust so—whilst we suggest that he has deified and idolized his own “ better feelings ” and “ amiable weaknesses ; ” that he has substituted a religion of emotional tenderness, for that stern though beautiful and loving reality which Scripture and the Church unfold to our view.

But whilst we blame thus severely the sin, let us deal gently by the sinner ; let us give him full credit for the high and holy feelings by which he has been led astray. And yet is there not an aggravation in the sin of those who misuse the very highest and holiest gifts of God ? who make the sweetest noblest impulses and instincts which God has given us an occasion for sin ? And does not a terrible responsibility rest on the head of him who leads the perishing to perish by bold assertions that they need not fear perdition ?

And again, is it kindness—real kindness—when we see a man or woman walking along the broad road that leadeth to destruction, to bid them be of good cheer ?

It is *comfortable* doctrine, no doubt, this of Mr. Kingsley's—comfortable *now* ; but will it be comfortable hereafter ? either to pastor or people ?

Let us, however, leave this discourse, in which there is much both to praise and blame that we have not touched upon, and proceed to that on Easter Day, where we shall find doctrine more *comfortable* still.

"Now what reason had St. Paul," says Mr. Kingsley, "to believe that these Colossians were risen with Jesus Christ? Because they had given up sin, and were leading holy lives? That cannot be. The epistle for this day says the very opposite. It does not say, 'you are risen, because you have left off sinning.' It says, 'you must leave off sinning, because you are risen.' Was it then on account of any experiences or inward feeling of theirs? Not at all. He says that these Colossians had been baptized, and that they had believed in God's work of raising Jesus Christ from the dead, and that therefore they were risen with Christ. In one word, they had believed the message of Easter Day, and therefore they shared in the blessings of Easter Day; as it is written in another place, 'If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus Christ, and believe in thy heart that God has raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.'"—p. 86.

We have heard the charge severally brought against the doctrines of baptismal regeneration and justification by faith, by those who misunderstand those inestimable formulæ, that they naturally if not necessarily tend to the disparagement of repentance and holiness. But it never before was our lot to meet with the two placed side by side—both nominally accepted—both made apparently to minister to such an ungodly end. We say apparently; for we cannot bring ourselves to believe that Mr. Kingsley, with his zeal for God's glory and man's happiness, and his deep reverence for and keen appreciation of all that is pure and true and noble and lovely, can really mean to propound and inculcate such rank antinomianism. But to proceed:—

"Now these," says Mr. Kingsley, "seem very wide words, too wide to please most people. But there are wider words still in St. Paul's epistles. He tells us again and again, that God's mercy is a free gift; that He has made to us a free present of his Son Jesus Christ. That He has taken away the effect of all men's sin; and more than that, that men are God's children; that they have a right to believe that they are so, because they are so. For, he says, the free gift of Jesus Christ is not like Adam's offence. It is not less than it, narrower than it, as some folks say. It is not that by Adam's sin all became sinners, and by Jesus Christ's salvation an elect few of them shall be made righteous. If you will think a moment, you will see that it cannot be so. For Jesus Christ conquered sin and death and the devil. But if, as some think, sin and death and the devil have destroyed and sent to hell by far the greater part of mankind, then they have conquered Christ, and not Christ them. Mankind belonged to Christ at first. Sin and death

and the devil came in and ruined them, and then Christ came to redeem them; but if all that He has been able to do is to redeem one out of a thousand of them, then the devil has had the best of the battle. He, and not Christ, is the conqueror. If a thief steals all the sheep on your farm, and all that you can get back from him is one or two out of the whole flock, which has had the best of it, you or the thief? If Christ's redemption is meant for only a few elect souls out of all the millions of mankind, which has had the best of it, Christ, the master of the sheep, or the devil, the robber and destroyer of them? Be sure, my friends, Christ is stronger than that; his love is deeper than that; his redemption is wider than that. How strong, how deep, how wide it is, we never shall know."—p. 88.

All this is very ingenious, very clever, there is argument as well as humour in it. We shall not venture to break a lance with Mr. Kingsley on that field which he traverses so gallantly, and, as he appears to think, so triumphantly; but we will refer him to that Book of which he is the guardian—that KING of whom he is the minister. It is *there* that it is written; it is HE that hath said—

"*Wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and MANY THERE BE WHICH GO IN THEREAT: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and FEW THERE BE THAT FIND IT*."

"Upon you," says Mr. Kingsley, "and me, and foreigners, and gipsies, and heathens, and thieves, and harlots, and little children,—"

A singular position certainly in the climax of depravity for those whom our Lord referred to as models, and whom He loved so dearly!

"—upon all mankind, let them be as bad or as good, as young or as old as they may, the free gift of God has come to justification of life; they are justified, pardoned, and beloved in the sight of Almighty God; they have a right and share to a new life; a different sort of life from what they are inclined to lead, and do lead, by nature—to a life which death cannot take away, a life which may grow and strengthen, and widen, and blossom, and bear fruit for ever and ever. They have a share in Christ's resurrection, in the blessing of Easter Day. They have a share in Christ, every one of them, whether they claim that share or not. How far they will be punished for not claiming it, is a very different matter, of which we know nothing whatsoever. And how far the heathen who have never heard of Christ, or of their share in Him, will be punished, we know not, we are not meant to know. But we know that to their own Master they stand or fall, and that their Master is our Master too, and that He is a just Master, and requires

¹ Matt. vii. 13, 14.

little of him to whom He gives little ; a just and merciful Master, who loved this sinful world enough to come down and die for it, while mankind were all rebels and sinners, and has gone on taking care of it, and improving it, in spite of all its sin and rebellion ever since, and that is enough for us."—pp. 88, 89.

That all men since the death and resurrection of our Lord have a *capability* of salvation is a portion of that faith once for all delivered to the saints, for which we are bound earnestly to contend ; that we have no right to dogmatize either way upon the fate of those to whom, whether here or elsewhere, in English mines or African deserts, the message of salvation has never come, is equally clear : but that any man in his senses with his Bible before him, should assert as Mr. Kingsley *appears* to assert (for we still venture to hope that it is not his intention to convey such a meaning as his words naturally bear)—“how far they will be punished for not claiming it is a very different matter, *of which we know nothing whatsoever*,” appears to us perfectly monstrous. For Christ Himself has laid the point at rest for ever, having said with reference to those to whom the offer should be made—the Gospel be preached—“HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT SHALL BE DAMNED.”

It is a strange thing, this bastard charity, which is so much the fashion now-a-days, which makes one class of men object to denouncing the sin of schism, and another treat with equal tenderness that of idolatry—which makes this philanthropist object to capital punishments *here*, and that ignore them *hereafter* !

We should do Mr. Kingsley, however, great injustice if we accused him of seeking to eliminate hell from the theological horizon. He does not, we conceive, deny the existence or detract from the necessity of the place of torment, only he would revolutionize public opinion on the subject so as to bring it into accordance with the principles and sympathies of Christian Socialists ; he would in fact substitute a penal code of his own making for that which has been received always every where and by all. He thinks it unkind, and therefore unjust, to subject thieves, harlots, or even little children to future punishment ; but he would invest the saying of Abraham to Dives with a prophetic force and an oecumenical application, “*Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things : but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented ;*” and in apportioning the degree of punishment to each offender, he would put his worldly possessions into one scale as the measure of his torment in the other. A poor man, in Mr. Kingsley’s opinion or rather feeling, cannot deserve, or if he do deserve, will not receive the second death.

We can scarcely believe such to be Mr. Kingsley's cool deliberate judgment on these things: yet such is undoubtedly the tendency of his teaching—such is the persuasion which they would naturally produce on the minds of his auditors, the villagers of Eversley, and the people of England.

How far more truth, and justice, and holiness, and beauty is there in the following eloquent passage from the writings of Dr. Hook:—

“Rich men, behold your God! Watch Him; see Him a poor man, a poor destitute, a servant, a hard-working poor man. Rich men, watch your God! Watch Him at his lowly calling, toiling for his daily bread; watch Him, and be ye humble; reverence the station of poverty, consider the poor and needy, amend the condition of the working classes of society. Believe not the flattering world, when it says that yours is the best condition in which to serve God. The Bible teaches us the reverse; and it may be that, at the last day, you will find that the person in this parish, who had led the most godly and saint-like life, coming nearest to the perfect pattern set by our Divine Master, is some unknown hard-working poor man, living in a wretched abode, to speak to whom you would now think it a condescension! How changed will things be, at the last hour, when Dives and Lazarus are both standing before Him, Whose countenance will then be watched with all that trembling anxiety, with which men now watch the face of their judge, ere he opens his mouth to pronounce the sentence. The Apostle exhorts to hospitality, ‘because, he saith, thereby some (as was the case with Abraham) have entertained angels unawares.’ So let us be exhorted to deal kindly and considerately with the pious poor; for in so doing, we may be showing regard to some who will have far higher places in the kingdom of glory, than we ourselves shall ever attain unto. Well were it, if this thought abode more constantly in the minds of men.

“Poor men, behold your God! Watch Him! He, when on earth, had not where to lay his precious head. If you are poor, yet who was poorer than He? It was not a man only, but a poor man also, that your God became; and by becoming a poor man, He has sanctified pious poverty as a special order in society; a state holy unto all who submit unrepiningly to its privations,—to all who really take up their cross and follow their Lord whithersoever He may call them, and rejoice that He, Who knoweth what is best for their external state, hath kept this power in his own hands; of the things of this world, dividing to every man severally as He will².”

It would, however, be extremely unfair to Mr. Kingsley, did we suggest the impression that he neglects to inculcate lessons of virtue and godliness; and it is most gratifying to see how

² *Sermons on the Miracles*, vol. i. pp. 153—155.

earnestly and constantly he enforces the necessity under which we lie of seeking the aid of God's Holy Spirit to work out our sanctification.

"Seek those things that are above," says he, "and you shall find them. You shall find old bad habits die out in you, new good habits spring up in you; old meannesses become weaker, new nobleness and manfulness become stronger; the old, selfish, covetous, savage, cunning, cowardly, brutal Adam dying out; the new, loving, brotherly, civilized, wise, brave, manful Adam growing up in you, day by day, to perfection, till you are changed from grace to grace, and glory to glory, into the likeness of the Lord of men."—p. 92.

It is likewise very pleasing to see the very high value which this writer places on the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, and the continuousness with which he urges our obligation to receive it.

" 'These are great promises,' you may say," proceeds he—" 'glorious promises; but what proof have you that they belong to us? They sound too good to be true; too great for such poor creatures as we are; give us but some proof that we have a right to them; give us but a pledge from Jesus Christ; give us but a sign, an assurance from God, and we may believe you then.'

"My friends," rejoins the preacher, "I am certain—and the longer I live I am the more certain—that there is no argument, no pledge, no sign, no assurance, like the bread and the wine upon that table. We cannot trust our hearts and inward feelings; but that bread, that wine we can trust. Our inward feelings are a sign from man: that bread and wine are a sign from God. 'Take, eat,' said Jesus, 'this is my body; drink, this is my blood.' These are the signs that God has given you eternal life, and that life is in his Son. What better sign would you have? There is no mistaking their message; they can tell you no lies. And they can, and will, bring your own Gospel-blessings to your mind as nothing else can. They will make you feel as nothing else can, that you are the beloved children of God, heirs of all that your King and Head has bought for you when He died and rose again upon this day. He gave you the Lord's Supper for a sign. Do you think He did not know what the best sign would be? He said, 'Do this in remembrance of me!' Do you think that He did not know better than you or me, and all men, that if you did do it, it would put you in remembrance of Him?

"Oh! come to his table this day of all days in the year, and claim there your share in his body and his blood, to feed the everlasting life in you; which, though you see it not now, though you feel it not now, will surely, if you keep it alive in you by daily faith, and daily repentance, and daily prayer, and daily obedience, raise you up, body and soul, to reign with Him for ever at the last day."—pp. 93—96.

The later sermons contain, with some *very few* objectionable passages, much that is exceedingly beautiful in itself, and eminently profitable to these times, though ever and anon there is a visionary vagueness, or weak tenderness, or manifest partiality, which remind us that we are reading the composition of one who has adopted the ill-omened title of a Christian Socialist.

What, then, is it that you would say and do? Mr. Kingsley and his friends will very naturally reply. And they have a right to an answer. Already has the muttering of the tempest's voice been heard more than once in the distance; already do the waters heave beneath us; already do the timbers of our vessel politic begin to give and tremble; already are there signs in the heaven above, and on the earth beneath, and in the waters under the earth, which tell us unmistakeably that a day of trial—of fiery trial—is approaching.

He, therefore, who offers us safety and counsel, has a right to demand an explicit answer to the question, What do you propose instead? And we are ready to give that answer.

First, then, what will we say—say from the pulpit?

We will tell the rich of their crimes, quite as boldly, and sternly, and plainly as Mr. Kingsley; and we will add, that unless they amend their ways, they will without doubt perish everlastingly; for we love not to handle the Word of the Lord deceitfully, or to keep back from any class the whole counsel of God.

We will not with one class tell the poor that all their labours, and privations, and wrongs, and indignities are part of a blessed dispensation, whereof the rich are the divinely-accredited officials; nor with another, that they are all of them undoubtedly sure of salvation; but we will do as the inspired preachers of the Gospel did in the beginning. We will not hide from them the cruelty and injustice with which they are treated, but command them, as they hope heaven or fear hell—as they love the God who made them and the Saviour who died for them—as they hope for a peaceful death and a glorious resurrection, to follow his steps, “Who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; Who, when He was reviled, reviled not again; when He suffered, He threatened not, but committed Himself to Him that judgeth righteously.”

And what would we do?

We would strike at the very root of the evils from which we are already suffering, and which threaten us with utter destruction. It is madness—worse than madness—to shut our eyes to the danger: imperative interest, as well as imperative duty, force the subject and suggest the remedy.

We are suffering from the effects of *selfishness*: we must sub-

stitute *love* in its place. Our body politic is in danger of dissolution from the baneful results of division : we must cure the hurt by unity. Whilst maintaining those glorious institutions, which, having their foundation in the interests of humanity, and their antitypes in the government of the universe, have, in conjunction with the Bible and the Church, been, under God, the causes and the guards of Britain's freedom and Britain's greatness ;—whilst maintaining in their integrity the rights of property and upholding in all divine fulness the claims of authority, civil and ecclesiastical, domestic and economic ; we must destroy at once and for ever all those conventional barriers which separate the orders of society and impede the current of love, and substitute for the hateful *esprit de caste*, the lovely and the loving *esprit de corps*.

We must promote the well-being, physical, moral, and intellectual, of the working classes ; give them education ; give them refinement ; teach them accomplishments and elegances, as well as furnish them with clothes and housing, and meat and drink. We must receive them at our tables, not as paupers, but as guests. *If* the clergy would begin, the laity soon would follow.

But here we are stopped by the cry, Oh ! impossible—impossible ! Nay, we have seen it done ; and, what will tell perhaps more with some persons than reason or right, we have seen the fruit of it. There was a parish, a few years since, in the centre of a district absolutely devastated by incendiarism. Night after night did the engines rush through the streets of that village, arousing the sleepers from their rest. Far and near there was no exemption—no escape. But whilst destruction and desolation visited every other spot within a circuit of many miles, man sought not to violate, and God spread his everlasting arms around that solitary spot, where ministered one who realized in his life, as well as his language, the Brotherhood of Baptism and the Membership of Christ.

ART. III.—*Life and Times of St. Bernard.* By Dr. AUGUSTUS NEANDER. Translated from the German by MATILDA WRENCH. Rivingtons.

“BERNARD was born at Fontaines, near Dijon, in Burgundy, in the year 1091,” says our author. “His father Tecelin, a knight of an ancient and noble family, was too much engaged in deeds of arms to have leisure to devote himself to the education of his son, and it therefore devolved on his mother Aletta, a woman of a gentle and pious disposition. At that time there appeared to be no choice between the turbulent and dissolute mode of life of the upper ranks, too often connected with deeds of rude and lawless violence, and the absolute retirement of the monastic life, which from the force of contrast was held in the greater veneration.”

That there were only those two modes of life to choose between is, we suppose, what the author or the translator means; but the narrative goes on to tell of Bernard's education, of the pains taken to allure him with the pleasures of life, or to corrupt him by the charms of profane learning. He withstood them all, and “when he was journeying alone to meet his brothers, who were in the camp of the Burgundian army, then engaged in besieging the castle of Grenie, this idea” (that of the high and holy destiny for which his mother intended him) “and the image of his chiding mother filled his whole soul. Upon this he retired into a church, which was upon the road, and prayed that God would confirm him in his purpose of becoming a monk. With the ardour peculiar to him, he now not only hastened to execute his resolution, but he also sought to communicate his own inclinations to his kinsfolk and friends. His persuasions were effectual with many. His uncle” (Gaudry, Count of Touillon), “a great and wealthy landed proprietor, and a man of high renown in arms, was the first to join him, and his example was followed by all Bernard's brothers, with the exception of Gerard, the second,” who, however, eventually embraced the monkish life, and the father, Tecelin, himself followed the example of his sons some years after. Bernard, the day that he renounced the world, began to preach so successfully against the world and its pleasures, that he had soon made many converts.

“Many of these new votaries being married, he thought it incumbent on him to provide a retreat for those ladies who par-

anticipated in the purpose of their husbands, and he caused the nunnery of Juilly, in the diocese of Langres " (near Dijon) " to be erected for them." How he could erect such an establishment, or by what means he effected it, we are not informed. But for himself he made choice of " the convent of Citeaux (Cistercium), situate in a barren wilderness, in the diocese of Chalons-sur-Saone." " To this convent, then presided over by Stephen Harding, an Englishman "—" Bernard retired with more than thirty associates, in the year of our Lord 1113," being at that time twenty-two years of age. " He soon excited observation and astonishment by the personal activity which he had the power of combining with the most profound abstractedness, and by his command over his bodily appetites."

His reputation drew so many votaries to the monastery, that the Abbot Harding granted a site for the foundation of a new abbey,—that of Clairvaux.

" It was a wild and desolate spot in the bishopric of Langres, and had formerly, when a robbers' cave existed there, been known by the name of the Valley of Wormwood (Vallis Absinthialis), but since the extirpation of this plant, it had been called the clear or bright valley (Claravallis). It was in the third year of his profession that Bernard was called to preside as abbot over the newly-established convent. This was in the year 1115." " He was then in his twenty-sixth year, and so emaciated as rather to resemble a corpse than a living being."

His health was indeed so seriously injured, that he suffered all his life from the too rigid fasts he had kept, and was at this time, by order of the Bishop of Chalons, put under the care of a physician, who proved a miserable quack, and under whose treatment he was kept in a hut apart from his convent; but—

" no sooner was he released from this state of surveillance, than, with his abbot's place, he resumed his former austerities. The whole convent was animated by his spirit and example. Men of illustrious descent, who had formerly played a distinguished part on the theatre of the world, now, by their hard labour in the sweat of their brow, and by their ascetic self-denial, which at that era ever made the most profound impression on the devotion of the nobles and people, and brought in the most costly offerings, prepared for the convent and district of Clairvaux (where the soil at first yielded them only the scantiest sustenance) the great wealth that in some decades of years it had acquired."

The following is quoted from the contemporary author of St. Bernard's life :—

" It was a dreary spot, inclosed by gloomy woods and rugged mountains, and those who came down from the mountains, and saw this

valley filled with men, among whom no idleness was permitted, each engaged in active labour and busied in performing his allotted task, in silence deep as that of the night, and only interrupted by the clang of the workmen and the hymns of praise to God, were so awed by this solemn stillness, that they forbore to speak on any but sacred subjects, as long as they were within the precincts of the abbey."

Their diet during the first year, before the ground was sufficiently prepared to yield any produce, consisted, we are told in a note, of a coarse bread, made of barley and millet and beech leaves, cooked in salt and water. And the hearts of some of the brethren began to fail them in the course of that first long and dreary season of cold, hunger, and privation of every sort, which lasted sixteen or seventeen months, so that it required all the influence and exertion of Bernard to prevent the utter abandonment of his infant settlement. And he suffered so much himself, that he was obliged to give up in part the strictness of the Benedictine rule, and to live in a separate dwelling, only visiting the monastery when necessary. Nor did he again return to his former strict seclusion. He had already founded the abbey of Fontenoi. He sent twelve monks to fix on a suitable situation, and placed Godfrey, one of his original companions, at their head. They here enjoyed the singular privilege of being allowed to fight among themselves, and receive absolution for having done so. And they also had the good fortune to gain from Philip the Bold, of Burgundy, an exemption from furnishing his dogs with white bread.

But though no longer engaged "in the *active* duties of the monkish life," Bernard was "regarded with universal veneration," and persons of all ranks came to receive his instruction.

"He took a lively interest in all affairs of importance, and made use of the penetration and eloquence that were natural to him to adapt himself to the particular circumstances of every individual." "In him the practical and the sensitive were the predominant tendencies." "At that era, when the administration of justice was still in a great measure dependent on the arbitrary will of the nobles, a certain vassal of the Count Thibaut, of Champagne, named Humbert, had suffered banishment and confiscation of goods." "He became a houseless and destitute wanderer, and left his wife and children in the most wretched and hopeless condition. They had recourse to Bernard, and implored his mediation with the count." "Bernard wrote himself to the count as follows:—'Had I asked of thee gold or silver, or the like, I am fully persuaded that I should have obtained my request.'" (He had already applied through some of the abbots of the province to the count in behalf of Humbert, in vain.) "Wherefore, then, am I counted unworthy to obtain from you the only thing I have asked, and that not in my own, but in God's name."

not for my own sake, but far more for yours? Know you not that with what measure you mete it shall be measured to you again? Know you not that it is as easy, ay, a thousand times easier, for God to cast you out of the heavenly inheritance, than for you to eject Humbert from his patrimony? There are indeed cases where the guilt is so manifest that justice leaves no room for mercy; but even then you must take vengeance in sorrow and trembling, impelled rather by necessity and judicial duty, than by any desire of avenging yourself! These representations had their due effect."

We next find Bernard exhorting, and successfully, to a more pious course of life, Archbishop Remi, of Sens, and then defending him and the Archbishop of Paris from the persecution of Louis VI., and he wrote to the king threatening him with the Pope's interference; and after several bishops had thrown themselves at the king's feet in behalf of the archbishops in vain, Bernard reproached him most vehemently, and declared that he would be punished by the death of his eldest son Philip—this prince did die three years afterwards, but this prophetic curse of Bernard's had at the time no effect upon the king, who was, by the interference of the bishops, excommunicated, and promised to restore the church property, but on the interdict being removed refused to do so, and proceeded to further spoliation.

"Upon this Bernard complained to the Pope in his own name," and "it is probable that these representations had their effect, and that the Pope espoused the cause of the archbishop." "But the Court of Rome was not altogether pleased with Bernard's reforming zeal, and the cardinals looked with jealous eyes on the man by whom princes, bishops, and even Papal legates submitted to be guided," and he was advised not to "trouble himself so much with the affairs of this world, since this was unbecoming in a monk."

From which reproach he justifies himself with more spirit than discretion; but he was soon called upon again by the Pope's legate to assist in the deliberations at Troyes, on the rules to be given to the new order of the Temple, and he then became involved in a long controversy with "Peter the Venerable, the president of the important order of Cluniac monks."

Controversy indeed we can scarcely call it, for in the personal connexion of Peter and Bernard there appears to have been a degree of affection and forbearance, that not all the rivalry of their respective monasteries could cool or lessen. The contrast between Clairvaux and Clugni appears indeed to have been sufficiently striking—Clugni in all the pomp of an over-endowed, unrestrained foundation—charitable from ostentation, magnificent, profuse, and licentious from choice.

In the contest of the rival Popes Anaclet II. and Innocent II. :

“The decision between the rival claims of the respective Popes was remitted by King Louis to his bishops, and they accordingly assembled at Etampes for this purpose. Bernard, whose voice had the greatest influence, was invited to attend both by the king and the bishops.”

Bernard further proceeded to England to prevail on Henry of England to recognize Innocent, and had great difficulty in doing so. Finding his efforts

“unavailing, Bernard at length exclaimed, ‘You dread bringing guilt upon your soul by recognizing Innocent; well then, I tell you to think only how you may answer for your other sins in the sight of God, and I will be responsible for this.’ These words touched the king’s heart, and he was moved by them to declare himself for Innocent.”

“In Germany as well as in France the most eminent bishops had already declared in favour of Innocent,” and the Emperor Lothaire invited him into the Imperial territories.

“Innocent set out at once, accompanied by Bernard who was always about him, and whose ready eloquence and talents for business were peculiarly useful to him.” “At Lullich he found Lothaire, who followed by a numerous and brilliant retinue of nobles and bishops, rode down the principal street in which the cathedral was situated, and there, alighting from his steed, made his way to the horse of the Pope, and then taking its bridle in one hand, while with the other he held aloft his staff, as Defender of the Faith he led Innocent into the sacred edifice.”

Bernard, after accompanying Innocent on his fruitless journey to Rome, returned to his own country, whence he addressed letters to the Pisans exhorting them to maintain their town as the seat of the true Pope; and to Innocent advising him to choose Pisa as the seat of the apostolic dignity. And when Louis VI. quarrelled with Innocent, Bernard wrote to the king, and succeeded in persuading him to acknowledge the authority of Innocent. He then again took up his residence in Italy for some time, and at Milan, which had always espoused the party of Anaclet, the influence of Bernard soon excited them to a wish of being reconciled to Innocent.

“Many of them” (the Milanese nobles and clergy) “seized with a passion of veneration for Bernard and for the ascetic lives of the Cistercians, at once assumed the habit of the order, attracted the esteem and reverence of the people, and had a powerful effect in disposing them in favour of Innocent.” “The extraordinary effect produced by his (Bernard’s) presence is described by an eye-witness (Landulfo the younger): ‘At his nod all gold and silver ornaments were removed

from the churches, and shut up in chests, as being offensive to the holy abbot: men and women clothed themselves either in hair cloth, or in the meanest woollen garments.'"

The Milanese anxious to keep Bernard among them,

"assembling in festival procession, they proceeded singing hymns and psalms of jubilee to the church where he resided, and entreated his acceptance of the archiepiscopal office."

But he had long determined against taking any such office, and, after mediating between Pavia, and Cremona, and the Milanese, in 1135 he returned to France.

"The news of his coming flew before him, and on his passage over the Alps, he was met by crowds of shepherds and peasants, who came down from their dwellings on the rocks to see him, and returned to their rude houses rejoicing when they had received his blessing." "Bernard was not allowed to enjoy a life of retirement and contemplation amid his monks for any lengthened period."

He was called to accompany the legate of Pope Innocent to the court of William IX., of Aquitaine and Poitou (father of Elinor, queen of our Henry II.), who had taken advantage of the quarrels between the popes to dismiss several bishops on his own authority, and Bernard having in vain remonstrated and negotiated,

"repaired to the church for the purpose of celebrating a High Mass. The count, who, as an excommunicated schismatic did not dare to assist at the ceremony, remained standing outside the door, and Bernard having pronounced the words of consecration over the bread, and given his blessing to the people, made his way through them to the place where he stood, bearing in his hand the paten with the consecrated bread, and then with a stern and menacing countenance, and eyes flashing with indignation, he addressed the prince in these awful words: 'Twice already have the servants of the Lord in united conference supplicated you, and you have despised them; lo, now the Blessed Son of the Virgin, He who is the Head and the Lord of the Church which you persecute, appears to you, behold your Judge, at whose voice every knee is bowed both in heaven and in earth, the Judge to whom you must one day surrender your soul: and will you reject Him, as you have rejected his servants?' Count William, horror-stricken and trembling in every limb, fell suddenly to the ground as if attacked by epilepsy."

He gave way, and reinstated the bishops, and died at Compostella, on a pilgrimage to atone for his sins.

"Bernard having thus succeeded in accomplishing the objects of his mission returned to Clairvaux, where, seated in a bower, shaded by

twining blossoms (which he had caused to be erected in the most secluded part of the valley), he remained in the enjoyment of his elevating contemplations till he was summoned from his retirement by the affairs of Italy."

Pope Innocent having been forced to apply again to the Emperor Lothaire against Roger the Norman, thought his application useless, unless backed by a letter from Bernard to the emperor; and when the imperial arms proved victorious, and Innocent was established at Rome, and after the death of Anaclet, when the anti-papal party elected a new anti-Pope, Victor III., Bernard persuaded him to abdicate his new dignity.

"Victor came to him by night, and, laying aside his papal ornaments, was conducted by Bernard into the presence of Innocent, when he cast himself at his feet, thus, the unity of the Church was once more restored throughout Rome; and this era of divisions and perplexity gave place to one of universal rejoicing. Bernard was regarded by all as the general peace-maker, and honoured and lauded as the father of the country."

Bernard's next public employment was in a long and complicated quarrel of the Count de Vermandois, and Louis of France, and the Pope, in which after fearlessly rebuking all parties, and bringing on the count and the king the horrors of excommunication, he at length succeeded and persuaded Lewis to a complete reconciliation. He did not even spare the Pope himself; he addressed him indignantly on the misapplication of his patronage; and soon after began his controversy with Abelard, whose philosophical theology Bernard maintained to be inconsistent with true piety. He began by private remonstrance; and their first actual collision, we are told in a note, was on occasion of a visit of Bernard to the Paraclete convent, where he was received as an angel from heaven, and where he took upon him to reprove Abelard's introduction of the word "super-substantial" for "daily" bread in the Lord's Prayer. This interference with Abelard's own ministry was of course unpardonable; and they continued their disputes, till Abelard challenged Bernard to a public argument before the most eminent prelates of Rome, in a synod at Sens, in 1140. But Abelard withdrew from the contest, and appealed to the Pope; and Bernard being all-powerful at Rome, Abelard was condemned as a heretic, forbidden to preach, all his writings ordered to be burnt, and he himself to be imprisoned in any convent the French bishops chose to select. But before this sentence had reached France, Bernard and Abelard were reconciled through the mediation of Peter the Venerable.

Two short-lived Popes had succeeded Innocent, in whose

elevation Bernard had taken so conspicuous a part; and they were followed by Eugenius III., who, having been in the lowest rank of poor monks in the Abbey of Clairvaux, was elevated to the papal dignity; an event which seems to have not a little startled Bernard, who writes thus (we are told in a note) to the members of the sacred college, beginning with all the abruptness of surprise,—

“May God forgive you! but what have you done? You have recalled to the world a man already in the grave.” “Who put it in your heads to seize upon a simple and unlettered monk, buried in a cloister, and place him on the throne of St. Peter? It is absurd to take a poor fellow covered with rags, and to make him the master of princes and bishops, of kingdoms and empires.” “I by no means reject the idea of its being God’s work, who alone doeth wondrous things; but yet I tremble for my Eugenius.”

He subsequently addressed a letter of advice to “my Eugenius;” and on the breaking out of the Tiburtine disturbances at Rome, when the Pope was obliged to fly to Viterbo, Bernard wrote to the Romans, “I, a man, without authority, address myself to you the illustrious people;” it was, however, unavailing, as was likewise his entreaty to the Emperor Conrad, for his assistance in reinstating Eugenius. But an occasion arose in which the Pope could appear as head of the Church, independent of his Romish rebels; the newly-established Christian kingdom in the East was in a perilous condition; and Eugenius sent a circular letter to the king and nobles of France, exhorting them to march against the enemies of the cross, and empowering Abbot Bernard to act for him at Vezelai, where, at Easter, 1146, the crusade was to be preached, and there Bernard addressed an immense multitude from a scaffolding, in an open field, without the city. Louis VII., who had already assumed the cross, stood beside him; and

“the effect of his eloquence was so inspiring, that the whole assembled multitude rent the air with shouts of ‘The cross! the cross!’ and thronged around the scaffold to receive the sacred emblem from his hands, which, in the words of an eye-witness, he might rather he said ‘to scatter, than to distribute them.’ The whole supply of crosses prepared for the occasion being exhausted, Bernard was obliged to tear up his own garments to supply the deficiency.” “In an assembly held at Chartres, about three weeks after Easter, Bernard was requested to head the expedition, but this he declined to do.”

He succeeded in laying the evil spirit of a factious demagogue monk in Germany, Rudolph by name, who, under pretence of preaching up the crusade, was exciting the people to all sorts of

crimes, and he also succeeded in persuading the Emperor Conrad very reluctantly to join the crusade.

After Louis had been solemnly invested as leader of the expedition by the Pope himself, in the Abbey of St. Denis, Bernard accompanied Eugenius to Treves, to make some regulations in the German Church; and there he took upon him to entreat the interference of his holiness for the protection of the Abbess Hildegarde, who was by many venerated as a saint, others regarded her as a silly visionary, and others as one possessed by an evil spirit—Eugenius commanded her writings to be publicly read, and was so struck with them, that he gave her a certificate of his approbation; upon which

“her fame spread into all lands; theologians referred their disputes to her judgment; bishops and popes, princes and emperors, vied with each other in doing her honour, both personally and by letter, and in seeking her advice.”

We find Bernard again engaged in combating the heretical notion of a logical consideration of the Scriptures, at a council held by Eugenius, at Rheims, in 1148. His antagonist was Gilbert of Poitiers, a man of great learning and ability, and who was supported by the cardinals. Bernard drew up a Confession of Faith for the Gallican Church, of which the Pope approved, but the cardinals condemning it, Bernard contrived to reconcile all parties by declaring the confession to be only his own private sentiments. Gilbert retired from the contest uncondemned, and the cardinals declared themselves satisfied.

The Provost of Stirnfeld, a German priest, now entreated Bernard to write against the Armenian heretics; some of whom were discovered in Cologne, and they were hurried to the scaffold by the populace after three days had been spent in endeavouring to convert them; and he was then called on to oppose Henri, a Swiss by birth, who had obtained astonishing power over the minds of the people, but great as it was, Bernard was able to oppose him successfully, and at the end of one of his sermons at Thoulouse, on his desiring all those who still belonged to his, the true faith, to hold up their hands: the whole congregation did so at once en masse. On another occasion after his sermon, as he was mounting his horse, one of the sectaries came forward, and called out to him:

“ ‘ Know, my lord abbot, that the horse of our master, against whom you have been speaking so freely, is by no means so fat and well-conditioned as yours.’ Bernard, without manifesting the least disturbance, replied, with a good-humoured glance at the man: ‘ I do not

deny it, my friend ; but I would thou shouldst remember that this is a *beast* for which thou dost reprove me. Now to be fat and well-conditioned is suitable to the nature and appointment of beasts ; and God, who will not judge us for such matters, is not thereby offended ; but every man shall answer for *himself*.' And, so saying, he threw back his cowl, and discovered his wasted throat and thin and withered countenance ; and this was to the people the most conclusive refutation of the heretic."

Henri was at length arrested, and confined for life. And about this time Bernard's preaching so wrought upon Guinard, King of Sardinia, that he resigned his crown to his son, and retired to Clairvaux, where he died. But we have now arrived at the period of his life which Bernard called himself "the season of misfortunes." The Crusade, which he had so zealously promoted, had ended most disastrously, and reproaches against him as the cause of the destruction of so many thousands of gallant men, were poured in from every side ; and he nearly at the same time discovered that he had been cheated by his secretary, Nicholas, in a manner the most painful and injurious : he had possessed himself of the seals which Bernard was in the habit of using, and had forged letters in his name to the most frightful extent—in reply to which came all manner of imputations and slanders on Bernard's conduct and policy, which might well confound and dismay him.

From this time he appears little more in public, in the religious or political world. He devoted himself to the composition of his great work, "The Book of Considerations," in which he describes the corruptions of the Church, and dwells with great eloquence and earnestness in his address to the Pope on his too great attention to secular business.

His health began now to decline ; but while under the sufferings of a severe illness, and when he says of himself that he was "reduced to a state of almost inconceivable weakness," he at once forgot his illness, overcame his weakness, and quitted his sick bed, when he found he was called on to fulfil his mission of peacemaker. He was summoned by the Archbishop of Treves to pacify the burghers and barons of Metz, who had gone to war with each other.

"Bernard at once, forgetting his infirmity, roused himself from his sick bed, and hastened to the scene of strife. On the banks of the Moselle the ambassadors of the respective parties met, and he endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation ; but the arrogant knights, elated by victory, refused any terms, and, fearful of being overcome by his eloquence, hastily withdrew from the conference. Both parties prepared for battle, but Bernard, even now confident of the result, said to

his accompanying monks: 'Fear not, the desired peace is at hand.' In the afternoon Bernard did indeed receive a message from the nobles announcing their change of purpose. In the stillness of the night his words had penetrated their hearts."

And the contending parties were reconciled. This was the last public act of Bernard's life: he returned to Clairvaux, where he died at the age of sixty-four in the year 1153.

"About ten years after his death his canonization was proposed, and at the end of twenty years it was effected by Pope Alexander III."

We have here given an abstract of the life of this extraordinary man from the work before us, which is indebted to the translator not only for being put into excellent and easy English, but for some of the most interesting circumstances of his life, which are given in the notes by the translator. So very remarkable a story cannot be made dull; but nothing can be more cold than Neander's style, and his meagre detail of facts is wholly out of proportion with his discussion of controversial subjects. There he seems at home; the fervent character of the man, and the enthusiastic feelings of his age, are evidently not in the author's line.

The order of the Benedictines had been founded five hundred years before the birth of St. Bernard; it formed the rule of the Cistercian order to which he so early devoted himself, and in which he raised one hundred and sixty religious foundations. Of these Dr. Neander takes scarcely any notice. "He has," he says, "in his preface, "in accordance with my own view of the subject, embodied all that was present to my own mind." He should, therefore, have called it not the life of St. Bernard; but Dr. Neander's notion of St. Bernard. To make the public depend for information in the biography of a celebrated man on what his biographer's memory retains, is not treating the public very fairly. But however little of his hero's character was understood by his biographer, the readers of the work cannot fail to be interested in the genius, the feeling, the romance of St. Bernard's character. It was this union of deep sensibility with ardent activity; this devoted piety, this strong purpose which distinguished the man. It was also a part of the age: that age when peers and princes founded, and statesmen and warriors retired into monasteries; when kings' daughters were among their honourable women; when living, to live the vowed brother of some stern monastic rule; and dying, to bestow upon some such foundation all his worldly possessions, was esteemed the height of human virtue. It was, however, like all fervent feelings rather sudden than last-

ing, rather contagious than enduring. The fever fit of conventual devotion seemed to come on with all the fury of a moral frenzy, and then to subside to all the tameness of reaction after a violent crisis. The spread of these pious epidemics was like that of a physical plague: it seemed to extend from country to country, pervading all ranks, and subduing all ages, with a rapidity which surpassed all our modern instantaneousness of communication. But it was the very absence of a more general means of communication which occasioned it. A thousand ideas were not every day let loose upon the world in a thousand newspapers and magazines; one idea was not started by one party to be instantly knocked down by another—a subject was not set upon high to be “bowled to death” by every paper. It was not viewed on every side, handled in every direction, turned round to every gazing eye; adorned, abased, worshipped, derided, knelt to and mocked at the same instant. No! one idea—one notion—a superstition, a fanaticism, a frenzy for fighting, or a passion for piety was preached by a wandering friar, or ordained by the Pope, or exhorted from the monastery, and it was admired, loved, adopted and followed with all the unhesitating enthusiasm of single-minded zeal:—

“From pole to pole, from point to point it flew,
Spread as it went, and in its progress grew.”

It spread, it grew, it reached its acme, and then it died away. In his horror of human crime, and worldly wealth, and luxury and pride, Benedict founded his order, and laid down those rules so stern and sad, that they must bend or break the proud heart that was submitted to their thrall. But in the five centuries that had elapsed between its foundation and the year 1098, the vigour of the establishment had been benumbed; the life of the original institution was almost dead; the rules were neglected, their purpose forgotten, and the holy men who still clung to its decaying form, had neither the power nor the wish to restore it to its pristine energy. A crisis of zeal was at hand: the Cistercian order was founded; a restoration of the Benedictine rule in all its primitive strictness:—To rise two hours after midnight; no one to speak without being spoken to; to sleep clothed with their girdles on; every monk in turn to execute all the most menial offices of the house, and to wash the feet of all his brethren; no meat but to the sick; no letters or presents to be received without the abbot's leave; and every hour with its appointed service, its prayer, its labour, or its meditation. This revived order was founded by Robert, a nobleman of Champagne, who had been disgusted by the luxury and laziness of other mo-

nasteries. And into this convent Bernard retired at the age of twenty-two. That an old man who had trod the many ways of the world till tired and exhausted, should gladly enter where he could be at rest, is natural; but that a young man who had all the paths of life before him, and could fancy all their flowery charms, to whom the mere pleasure of exploring an untrodden road has so much fascination, seems unnatural and strange. That a warrior, loathing the scenes of blood and strife in which he had been struggling; that a man of the world who had become sated with luxury; that the statesman, sick of the vanity of his ambitious schemes, that these should seek to lose their sorrows or bury their disappointments, and atone for their wickedness in a life of penitence and prayer, we can readily comprehend, and can sympathize in their feelings; but here is a young gentleman, well born and well educated, and with so many means of independent distinction before him, voluntarily renouncing them for a life of total seclusion and abject obedience. All his family were soldiers, all the world were at war, the sword was sure to lead to fame and honours: he rejected them at once, and not only quitted the world himself, but persuaded thirty men to quit it with him. Among these was his uncle, a distinguished warrior, and a gentleman of fortune. An uncle to a young man of two-and-twenty usually thinks himself entitled to give advice to his nephew, to assist his father in disposing of the youth in the way they may deem most suitable. An uncle is very apt to lecture young gentlemen on their fantastic tastes, and to tell them a great deal of their own good sense, and experience, and knowledge of the world. But the nephew prevailed: his uncle, his brothers, and eventually his father, were all persuaded by the eloquence, the zeal, the devoted ardour of young Bernard.

That his renunciation of the world did not arise from a cold heart, or want of social affection, is proved by his successful eagerness to be joined by his family; and his warm-heartedness is strikingly shown in his letter about his cousin Robert, a young lad who had been particularly attached to him, and who was wiled away to the abbey of Clugni: though this occurred some years after Bernard's assuming the cowl, we give an extract from his letter to his cousin, as evincing an affectionate warmth, unembittered by his cloister life:—

“I have waited long enough, my dear son Robert, nay perhaps too long, in the hope that it might please God to soften your heart and mine.” “But since my expectation is vain, I can no longer conceal my sadness or restrain my sorrow.” “Let us then forget the past: I will not stop to examine into circumstances. I would fain efface the remembrance of them. I will speak only of my own affliction in being

deprived of your society." "I ask not the reasons of thy departure, I ask only why thou dost not return. Return, I entreat thee, and all shall be peace: return, and I shall again be happy."

With a heart so formed for domestic happiness, the utter rejection of them was a sacrifice indeed—a sacrifice that could arise only from his own conviction that he was doing right. It was the fervour, the sincerity of this conviction, which gave him the supreme, the irresistible power he possessed over all whom he chose to rule.

In person he was tall, and of a clear complexion, but of the most attenuated form. His countenance is described as serene and heavenly, and the chroniclers scarcely ever speak of his eyes without the epithet "columbinos," so dove-like was their expression of purity and simplicity.

Nothing could be more in accordance with the poetry of piety which belonged to that period, than the romantic situation and name of the site on which he founded his celebrated Abbey of Clairvaux. An open valley surrounded by wild and wooded hills, secluded from the haunts of man, alone with nature: a solitude, but a solitude of sunshine and cheerfulness. The light of day was full upon them, there was nothing to be concealed in shade, there was no need for the gloom of situation. There was force of mind in choosing such a spot: the stern severity of their lives was not to be nourished by any outward symbols of awe; the bright and blessed sun was to shine upon the scene: secure in inward steadiness of purpose, he did not dread "rejoicing nature."

The early struggles and privations that he and his followers endured, of which we have extracted the accounts, were enough to satisfy the most ardent desire for mortification, and sufficient to damp any but the most determined zeal; and indeed it required all the power and eloquence of Bernard to maintain the resolution of his followers; but he did maintain it: they triumphed over every obstacle, and finally established the Abbey of Clairvaux. He had previously founded, as we have seen, the Convent of Juilly, and in the course of his life above one hundred and sixty different religious establishments. Of these, as we have observed, Dr. Neander makes very little mention: they were not "present to his mind" we suppose; nor does he condescend to inform us how this multitude of vast buildings were raised. We are indebted to a note by the translator for the following interesting extract from Mabillon of a letter written by Haimo, Abbot of St. Pierre in Normandy, who saw a magnificent cathedral building where his parish church had stood.

“ Who has ever heard of such a thing ?—who has ever seen princes, mighty lords, men-at-arms, and delicate women, bend their necks to the yoke to which they suffer themselves to be attached, like beasts of draught, so as to move heavy burdens? Sometimes thousands of them are seen fastened to one machine, of great weight, loaded with wheat, wine, and oil, with lime, stone, and all the materials necessary for the workmen, which they drag from surprising distances. And what is more extraordinary, this innumerable company pursues its march without noise or confusion. Their voices are never heard but at a given signal, when they are raised to implore pardon for their sins, or to chant the praises of God.”

Though this is not the description of the raising of one of Bernard's own establishments, it was in this manner that he formed them.

No steam-engines, no railroads, no competition for wages, no buying of shares, no declaring of dividends, no helps of science, no bribes of interest, no hope of worldly gain, no expectation of human happiness was the spur to this impassioned industry; the building they were toiling to erect was to them the tomb of earthly hopes, the scene of constant bodily mortification and mental slavery; and yet with one mind, one heart, they laboured,—the old, the young, the fair, the rich and the proud, as one body, to one mighty purpose.

That one young man should, so soon after his taking upon him the habit of his order, have such influence as to erect a monastery, and to be, at five-and-twenty, named for its abbot, is one of the most marvellous anomalies which is furnished by the history of mankind. He had, at this time, persuaded all his brothers, his father, and his uncle to become monks. He had so wrought upon the wife of his eldest brother, that on separating from her husband when he took the vows, she also retired from the world, and became abbess of the nunnery of Juilly. To this nunnery also retired his sister Hombeline, on the death of her husband, brother to the Duke of Lorraine; and the Duchess of Lorraine, also, Bernard converted; and all this before he was six-and-twenty. But the most anomalous part of the anomaly was, that after preaching retirement from the world, rejection of worldly interest, devotion to heavenly things, and a life of monastic strictness, and utter seclusion, he ceased himself to be the denizen of a cloister: he lived in the world; and after the three or four first years of his monastic life, he quitted, never more to be resumed, the very austerities of that Benedictine sternness which he enforced, as the first of duties, on every one else.

There can be no doubt in the sincerity of his first vocation to

the cloister; there can be no suspicion attached to his early piety. It would seem that he did really think that he, at two-and-twenty, was devoting himself to a life of utter seclusion; that the walls of Clairvaux, and the hills of her valley were to be the boundaries of his earthly sight; that the bright sunshine of her valley was to be his only cheerfulness; that the cultivation of the few acres about these walls, and the added numbers of his converts within them, was the end and aim of his ambition; and perhaps it would have been so, but that his bodily health gave way. He was obliged to withdraw, as we have seen, from the severities with which he had overtaken his infirm frame. His constitution was incurably shaken; he never recovered the sufferings of that first year of struggle and starvation. He never more resumed his permanent residence at Clairvaux, though he retained the office and the power of abbot all his life.

To a mind so ardent as his, the nature of a conventual life, without its austerities, was, of course, intolerable; and for objects for his passionate zeal, he looked out into the world. He early formed, and always adhered to, his resolution of not accepting any official situation beyond that of abbot of Clairvaux. He became one of those remarkable men, who have been in all ages, who are satisfied with the reality of power without the name of it; who have said—

πῶς δῆτ' ἐμοὶ τυραννὶς ἡδίῳν ἔχειν
ἀρχῆς ἀλύπου καὶ δυναστείας ἔφν,

He felt that he could lead the minds of men—he had proved it: and throughout the succeeding forty years of his life, he continued to lead, to sway, to rule—not merely to piety and prayer, not merely leading men and women to devote themselves as monks and nuns to the service of God,—but he governed the highest and the proudest in the practical affairs of life. To persuade, as a preacher, that it was a certain road to eternal happiness to renounce the world, and, laying aside the cares and crosses of life, to bring all sorrow, and all disappointment, and anxiety to the calm of the cloister, seemed to require a different power of mind, another species of eloquence than that which should stem the force of those cares and anxieties, and bid them, at his pleasure, to be still. The temptation to a man feeling himself endowed with such powers, to seek for some high post where he could exercise them, seems almost irresistible; but whether from the certainty that he would be more useful untrammelled by official dignity, or from the more noble ambition to serve his Maker and his fellow-man in the most

effectual way he could devise, or whether from the meaner ambition of mere power, the belief that as the adviser he should be greater than the advised, we cannot, and we ought not, perhaps, to judge. Bernard could not foresee to what an extent his power would reach, but he possessed the rare ability to know where it should stop, and in the height of his career knew how to possess himself; and, unintoxicated with his success, to be still superior to the personal distinctions of wealth and pomp of station.

To feel that his voice can rule the multitude, is so very fascinating a conviction that there have always, and always will be found men who seek only this fleeting glory, and who, with no fixed aim, have the gift to seize upon the popular objects, and to follow where they seem to guide; who, laying hold of some grievance, real or imaginary, that has irritated the multitude, make it the topic of their eloquence; and while they are declaiming in favour of the rights of their fellow-man, are thinking only of their own applause; men to whom the draughts of human flattery, *en masse*, have become so intoxicating that they cannot forego them. "Verily, they have their reward." Admired, applauded, wondered at—and forgotten.

There are others, again, who like to stand by the pilot and direct his course, who lay out the chart, and direct the course, and enjoy the secret satisfaction of knowing it was their doing; a sort of mysterious pride which, if less dangerous than that of the demagogue drunk with his own applause, is as selfish, and as ephemeral a glory, and is usually connected with more sordid ends of personal lucre. But St. Bernard preserved to the end of his life the simplicity of his early habits, and the reality without the form of the life of a devotee. Still we cannot but think he was not free from human vanity or human ambition, as we shall presently show. One most remarkable feature in his character and conduct was the absence of that monkish mania for the aggrandizement of their order. It takes the place of family affection and of personal selfishness. Men who have renounced all the ties of kindred, and who seek no advantages for father, brother, or nephew, and who regard no personal suffering, humiliation, or labour, are yet as selfish, as ambitious, as mean in their objects for their Order, as the most abandoned place-hunter or pension-coveter for himself or his family. St. Bernard appears to have been superior to this weakness. He does not seem to have sought to place Benedictines or Cistercians in every situation of profit or of eminence, and though he was the founder of so many Cistercian abbeys and convents, it was in the sincerity of his belief that he was doing God's service. He constantly

upheld the strictness of their rules, he steadily inveighed against any insidious luxury, any outward magnificence. He thought his brethren, like himself, free from all the pomp and circumstance of monastic magnificence, and his foundations continued to be really the unadorned seclusions from the world for which they were founded.

His first appearance as a mediator in the quarrels of the world was as the advocate for the banished Humbert with Thibault of Champagne. His first controversy was with the monks of Clugni. He was in this more admirable, perhaps, than in any other transaction of his life, for the rivalry of monastic establishments is in general passing the rivalry of individual man or woman, and yet in his contest with the Venerable Peter, these two supporters of rival establishments in the same order, a circumstance which usually, like family quarrels, aggravates the bitterness of both parties, carried on their discussion as friends, as pious men really eager for the glory of God, and the real spiritual welfare of their fellow-creatures; the more surprising from the pride of superior sanctity in the abbey of Clairvaux with which the luxury of Clugni was rebuked.

His controversy with Abelard was not so blameless. The logical powers of his adversary, and the sense which, to a man of Bernard's genius, must have been always present, that the exertion of the intellect, and the free discussion of religious subjects must be in the end advantageous, made him feel himself in the wrong—a feeling which must always occasion a want of confidence, a loss of temper. Bernard was too able a man to believe that learning and zeal for truth would be put down by Papal dominion, or episcopal authority, or the statutes of Councils. He came to the discussion unwillingly, and he came out of it discredibly.

The other contests against schismatics which we have brought forward in our extracts, were not much to his credit either. They are, however, most interesting from their exposition of the temper of the times. As we have said, a vocation to piety, a frenzy for self-inflicted sufferings, a plague, a fanatic plague was allowed to spread itself, like the bodily plague, unrestrained. No Board of Health interfered to mitigate the fury of the disease, no Cordon Sanitaire to arrest its fury, no Quarantine to stay its progress, and stand between the living and the dead. Fancicism was allowed in like manner to gain upon and subdue mankind; schism or heresy only, like the leprosy, was deemed worthy the interference of the legislature. A leper was banished from society, secluded in some solitary hut, shunned by all humanity, loathed by his fellow-beings, an outcast doomed and abhorred;—

a heretic was as a leper, the contagion was too terrible to be endured, he was hunted down, and if allowed to live, it was only to be banished from society, secluded in some iron cloister, shunned and loathed by his fellow-men, an outcast doomed to the abhorrence of humanity.

That St. Bernard should have assisted in this persecution and excommunication was only part of his character and of the purpose of his life. In his character, too, in the romantic part of it, was his upholding Hildegarde and her visions. He was very apt to have portentous and prophetic dreams himself, and it was quite natural that his good sense, great as it was, should give way before the charm which such supernatural gifts have always possessed for the unworldly-minded and enthusiastic. The raptures of an abbess could not interfere with the power of the Church, they only strengthened it. Hildegarde met with that favour from him which he would not yield to Abelard; her absurdity might be sanctioned and recommended by an edict from the Pope, and all men's minds should, and, as we have seen, did obey the edict, but that men should be advised to think without the leave of their spiritual superiors was not to be endured. That men should be instructed that they not only had souls to be saved, but that they had the power of judging for themselves about that salvation was an audacity that was at once to be put down and annihilated.

More honourable to St. Bernard, and more worthy of his title of saint, and far more extraordinary was the power which was given to him, which he did not assume, but which was, by common consent, adjudged to him—that of peacemaker, healer of differences, and calmer of angry feelings. He really did possess and use for the best and most hallowed ends that power which the encomiasts of the Popes have ascribed to them; that of mediator between temporal powers, for the preservation of that peace, which was the very essence of the religion of which they professed to be the head. Except in exhorting Christendom to a crusade, St. Bernard appears only as the advocate for peace. And in rousing all the Christian princes to a war against the infidels, he was, in fact, preaching harmony among themselves. Nothing but the most entire unanimity of purpose could here succeed; and the ability with which he planned, and the success with which he won all men to this great work, we have given ample extracts to show, were all surpassed by the moderation and humility with which he refused to become a second Peter the Hermit. A greater temptation would hardly have been presented to one not only conscious of his powers, but in the very height and glow of their success; he had all Christendom at his

command. At his bidding the internal quarrels of sovereign and serf ceased ; the wars between nation and nation were suspended, and the zeal for monastic life was turned to another end. Those very labours, of which we have extracted the account, where all ages, sexes, and ranks had, with one enthusiasm, devoted themselves to one object, were at his call suspended : the mighty current of devotion was midway in its course arrested, turned aside, and bade to flow, obedient to his word. That at such a moment a man should be able, when it had done the work to which he was summoned, to lay aside his power and authority, was a heroism unequalled, except perhaps by Washington ; and his moderation was less wonderful, because he resigned only temporal, Bernard gave up spiritual rule—a power so much greater, and so much more insidiously tempting, as so much more easily veiled under the names of devotion to God's service, pious labours, zeal for the Church, and all the specious names by which the love of power is concealed, not only from the eyes of the vulgar, but from a man's own conscience.

To step in between tyrant barons and upstart burghers, and persuade them that both were wrong, and that both must give way ; to be called on by princes and bishops to settle their disputes, and to allay the spiritual pride of the one, and the grasping worldliness of the other, was his great privilege. A simple monk, with no other rank than his local title of Abbot of Clairvaux, without the terrors of excommunication, or the possession of armies, or the advantages of wealth, by his single force of virtue and eloquence he ruled the most unruly. A poor, delicate-framed man, slight and spare, infirm, wasted with fasts and vigils, a foreigner to many of those whom he was called upon to govern ; a Frenchman, belonging to a nation whose genius and whose situation have always made it so dreaded a rival by all the other nations of Christendom, yet was he the arbiter alike to German, and English, and French.

And when these labours were over, when he retired from the courts and camps, where he had been so honoured, and after being received wherever he went with the enthusiastic honours that usually attended a conqueror, and worshipped almost as a supernatural being, he returned to Clairvaux, to sit in a bower, and meditate on heavenly things. What can be a truer picture of the poetry of the times than this pale monk sitting in his flowery arbour, resting from the stormy scenes in which he had been so distinguished an actor, reflecting in solitude, or teaching those about him the great truths of their faith !

The eager part which Bernard took in the quarrels of the Popes,

appears to have been at first only that of a warm partisan, of what he believed to be the right. He afterwards became the friend and adviser of Innocent, his second self, his leader, his conscience. And with this secondary glory he was content; and no man was found at first to gainsay his power: but the cardinals at length began to be jealous of his authority; and they murmured against him: "Who made thee a ruler and a judge amongst us?" They were obliged, however, eventually to submit. The college of cardinals, the proudest, haughtiest, most intriguing set of self-seekers in existence—men with all the united faults of temporal and spiritual longings after place, with all the bigotry of monks, and all the narrow-mindedness of a corporation—with the double weakness of family claims, and the interests of their different orders, and with all their national prejudices in each party individually, besides their close borough system in general—the college of cardinals were forced to yield to the force of Bernard's character, and the steadiness of his purposes. Not only were they compelled to endure him as the adviser of Innocent, but after the short reigns of Celestine and Lucius II., they were obliged to submit to him as the governor of Eugenius; but they tried to avenge themselves; and though they did not succeed, their plan was worthy of such a body.

In the election of Eugenius, Dr. Neander has failed to remark the evident jealousy and irritation which it gave to Bernard. It was more than human nature could bear, that a poor ignorant monk of his own convent, one who had been employed in its most servile offices should, from the situation of head of an obscure convent of the Cistercian order at Rome, to which Innocent had appointed him, be made the head of Christendom. His abilities were nothing extraordinary, he belonged to no powerful family, unheard of and unknown except in his own cloister as poor brother Bernard who lighted the stove of a cold morning, he was all at once raised to the papal chair—the highest dignity in the world. At once he exchanged his coarse gown, and paltry situation in a small foundation, for the purple robes, and his monk's cowl for the Tiara—while Bernard, who had been in fact the pope himself during the reign of Innocent, was passed over unthought of, and left to the obscurity of his station as abbot over the poor brethren of Clairvaux. True he had always renounced all place, had always kept aloof from dignities, had refused all that had been offered, and magnanimously resisted the strongest temptations to situations of distinction, but it was not inconsistent in human nature that he should feel mortified, to find himself superseded by his actual servant. This was, we conceive, the intention of the

cardinals in pitching upon brother Bernard, late of the abbey of Clairvaux, as the successor to Lucius; they flattered themselves that the jealousy of his own monk would so incense the supreme abbot, that he would never be to him what he had been to his predecessor Innocent, by whom he had been chosen for a guide and confidant, to whose elevation he had so mainly contributed, and whose previous station had in it nothing that could excite the temper of the man they hated. It was an ingenious plan, and that it succeeded in part, as we think, the letter to him, which we have quoted, most clearly proves, but they calculated ill on this irritation lasting or interrupting the purpose which had been so long that of Bernard's life, to possess the reality without the incumbrances of power. They calculated ill in supposing that the conceit of the poor brother on his new elevation, or the envy of his superior, would do away the habit of submission in the one, or of command in the other. After the first burst of irrepressible jealousy and disappointment, Bernard, recovering his self-possession, saw what his course should be, and he immediately addressed to the new Pope a letter of advice:—

“ I dare no longer call you my son, for the son is become the father, and the father the son; yet I envy you not; for that which is lacking to me I trust to obtain in you, for you are my work.” “ Confiding, then, in you, more than in any of your predecessors for a long season, the universal Church rejoiceth, and especially that Church which has borne you in her bosom, and at whose breast you have imbibed new life. And shall I not share the common joy? Yea, truly, I confess it, I also rejoice, but in the moment of rejoicing fear and trembling seized me, for though I have laid aside the name of father, yet have I not laid aside the tender love and anxious solicitude of a father. You have taken a higher place, but not so safe a one; ‘ the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.’ ”

He then gives him excellent advice in the policy to be observed as head of the Church, and his sometime son and now his father, Eugenius, submitted at once to his guidance. Circumstances, too, favoured the subjection in which the Pope was to remain to the abbot. The disturbed state of Rome drove Eugenius to seek refuge in France, and he was indebted to Bernard's good offices for his favourable reception there.

It is not one of the least wonderful circumstances in the history of the Romish Church, that men continued to believe in the one and undivided supremacy of Christ's vicar on earth, at the very time that there were two rival candidates for the chair of St. Peter, each supported by equally violent partisans, and each party ready to believe that their pope was that head incapable of

error—a sort of melancholy absurdity, at which one can hardly smile. When Bernard advocated the cause of Innocent when he upheld his cause before King Roger

“in his palace at Salerno, arrayed in his royal robes,” he exclaims, “is it possible that the whole Eastern Church, almost all the Western nations, and all the monastic orders, all adherents of Innocent, should have been appointed to damnation, and that King Roger alone should have discovered the truth?”

And these arguments could prevail: after believing one man to have been the impeccable head, Roger submitted to believe in another. But the case was different now, Eugenius was universally acknowledged Pope: he was only driven from Rome by the factions of his temporal subjects, but it was not Eugenius, the pope and prince, who addressed them to persuade them “to leave the evil and choose the good,” it was, as we have seen, Bernard, “a man without authority address myself to you the illustrious people;” and a most eloquent address it is, but it was of no avail. He then wrote to the Emperor Conrad:—

“Is not Rome at once the head of the empire and the seat of the Apostles? I know not what advice the wise and great of the empire may give you; yet cannot I, in my simplicity, withhold my thoughts from you. ‘Gird on thy sword,’ then, ‘thou mighty man,’ and ‘render unto Cæsar that which is Cæsar’s, and unto God that which is God’s.’ As a sovereign it befits the emperor to defend his crown, as the advocate of the Church to defend the cause of the Church.”

But his remonstrances, in spite of his ingenious application of the text, so exceedingly different from its original meaning, were of no avail. The emperor was otherwise occupied, and he left Rome and her sovereign to take care of themselves. He took half the advice of St. Bernard, he carefully kept for Cæsar the things that he considered Cæsar’s, and he left the head of the Church to settle what should be considered those of God. But Bernard did not allow Conrad to enjoy the triumph of having resisted his eloquence, and here appears that concentrated ambition which was, we think, a part of St. Bernard’s character, he resolved to bend Conrad to his will, and he succeeded in wringing from him his reluctant consent to join in the crusade.

In the controversy with Gilbert, in which he was the adviser of Eugenius, Bernard does not appear to much advantage; for the jealousy of the cardinals now broke out openly, and he was obliged, as we have related, to declare the Confession of Faith which he had drawn up as that of the Romish Church, to be merely that of his own private belief; and the Pope, though he would

have sanctioned it, was forced to give way to the cardinals, and to acquiesce in Bernard's rather shabby method of getting out of the business. It was, however, a vain triumph on the part of the cardinals, for Bernard continued to be the adviser of the Pope and the reconciler of quarrels, the general and undisputed arbiter in all difficulties, temporal as well as spiritual. And though it appears he could be deceived, and his confidence abused where he had most confided, as in the case of his secretary, his knowledge of mankind, and of what would work upon their minds, continued to the last.

His Book of Considerations, though originally intended to be dedicated to Eugenius, he continued to work at after his death, which occurred a short time before that of St. Bernard himself. This work appears to have been intended as a manual for the conduct of the Popes, and to contain the beau ideal of what the representative of St. Peter should be. It shows the corruptions and inefficiency to which his dominion had even then arrived; and when we consider the authority which it retained so long after, and the pomp and magnificence with which it is still attended, we cannot but admire the genius which framed a system which has withstood such internal corruption and such external warfare. Little as it has adhered to this beau ideal drawn by a great and good man, it still exists, still holds its root in the credulity of mankind, still retains some of its original vigour; the sap still mounts, and it stands like some great tree, its branches withered, its core decayed, but its outside rind still nourished from the root it yet keeps in the earth; but it is of the earth, earthy, and is mouldering to its fall.

The very last act of St. Bernard was worthy of his best days, and in keeping with the noblest part of his character. He rose from his sick bed, as we have seen, to reconcile the barons and the burghers of Metz, and returned to Clairvaux only to die. There could not be wished for mortal man a nobler last act of existence, there could not be a nobler tribute paid to dying excellence than this recalling him almost from the tomb to allay the fury of mortal passion, and with a voice, as from another world, to bid them be at peace.

Even Luther speaks of this great man with enthusiastic praise; all his contemporaries almost worshipped him; and succeeding popes placed him in the calendar of saints. And yet what remains of his labours on earth? He founded no new order, he made no enduring reform, he produced no change in either the spiritual or temporal condition of the world. He was not the origin of any sect, he set forth no new doctrines.

His books are known only to historians and commentators. His monasteries have, like others, gone to decay and forgetfulness, or been destroyed in the anarchy of revolution. And yet he is still remembered, his story is still read with interest, and his character still admired for its purity and devotion. It is pleasing, it is flattering to the best feelings of humanity, to find mere virtue thus surviving all the accidents of time and change of manners; and we do but justice to the piety of mankind in bringing forward one of the few instances in which it has shown itself superior to the spirit of party and the bigotry of sectarianism.

There was in St. Bernard, as we have said, a degree of romance which is always fascinating, not only in itself, but as the usual accompaniment of genius. His early retirement from the world, his choice of a situation for his abbey, his embowered retreat, his delight in securing to his church the remains of the sainted Malachie (p. 283), his constancy to his ascetic form of life, the very character of his personal appearance, all belong to that species of high-souled fantasy which is born with, and which through life sustains the truly great through all the trials, disappointments, and disheartenings of their course. Some great ideal, "some orb hung in their mind's eye," to which they are always tending, and in the pursuit of which they draw after them the enthusiasm of the world.

The merits and the happiness of St. Bernard were those of his own individual character, his own native superiority and inborn virtue; his defects and his misfortunes were those of the age in which he lived, and the situation in which he was placed; his "season of misfortunes," the failure of the crusade which began in such pomp and enthusiasm, and which ended in such disaster and destruction, and the difficulties and disgraces in which he was involved by the treacherous conduct of Nicholas, were occasioned by the fanaticism of the time, and the wretchedness of the monastic system. His controversies, too, which are the great blot in his history, were those of bigotry against truth; they were the necessary failings of a cloister education, the inevitable acts of his situation as adviser to the head of an exclusive church. The power which he possessed as peacemaker, the authority with which he interfered to quell the disputes of emperors and bishops, princes and popes, was the authority of virtue. The resistless power by which he made a pope to strip himself at his bidding of his purple robes, lay aside the triple crown, and after having been seated in the papal throne, resume his private station; by which he persuaded other popes, in the full supremacy of universal dominion, to submit to his control;

by which he forced the haughtiest monarchs to yield to his advice; by which he induced whole armies, in the very passion of their battle, to lay down their arms at his command, was by the true spirit of universal Christianity embodied in his indomitable energy, enforced by his enthusiastic eloquence. His faults were the general faults of monkish bigotry; his merits those of individual Christian heroism.

ART. IV.—*Milton Davenant, a Tale of the Times we live in.* By JAMES BANDINEL, Author of "*Lufra; or, the Convent of Algarve.*" In Three Volumes. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1852.

How much controversy has been waged in modern days respecting the propriety or impropriety of controversial fiction! How much breath has been wasted, and how much good paper and ink have been expended, and how many printers have had to set up types, and how many compositors have revised laborious proofs, in order to denounce the presumed iniquity of guiding people to moral and religious conclusions by means of interesting or exciting narratives; and, all the while, the offenders (if so they can be considered) have never relaxed in their efforts to attain their end. We remember reading an essay once on this subject, which was said to have flowed from the pen of that most prolific of novel writers, G. P. R. James, Esq., and his denunciations of controversial fiction were earnest and severe, and even bitter in the extreme; yet none the less did a Gresley continue to send forth his sober, sensible, intensely English narratives, "English of the English," in their weakness as in their strength; and none the less did a Paget proceed to favour the world with those lively, stirring, earnest-hearted, but keen and energetic novelettes, which will not easily be forgotten, and the place of which could not be easily supplied. Then there is Miss Sinclair, of whom report speaks highly (we are not ourselves acquainted with her productions), representing, we believe, the moderate evangelical school; and there *was* Mrs. Sherwood, exceedingly Calvinistic, but also, we must add, endowed with great powers both of invention and description (indeed an impression was made on us in early life by some of her tales, which will, we think, never be erased); then, again, there was "Geraldine," which once created no slight sensation on the Romish side of the controversy, a book characterized by remarkable talent, despite its pertness and snapishness of tone: Neale and Monro too must be mentioned in such a list, though we think the fictions of the latter too often overstrained and unnatural, despite their great power and beauty, while the former has most dangerous tendencies. Numberless other writers might be mentioned; but we doubt whether any of these works may be calculated to create such a *sensation*, to have such a run at the circulating libraries, to elicit so many ana-

themas, "not loud but deep," or to evoke so many enthusiastic laudations as the work which lies before us, Mr. Bandinel's "Milton Davenant."

We are of opinion that the duty discharged by the author of *Milton Davenant*, though exceedingly painful, was not uncalled for in the present day; for it is not only direct Romanizing within the English Church, which he castigates severely, but the temper of mind which leads thereto; the perverse tastes and habits, and the morbid sentimentality of those who, preserving their silence on the subject of Roman doctrine, encourage, whether consciously or unconsciously, those vague desires and self-willed cravings, which are only too likely to end in unqualified submission to an imaginary, false ideal. Such characters as the "Rev. Charon Showtheway," and such advice as he administers to poor "Didymus Dyke," are unfortunately stern realities in the present times, and there seems little, or rather no use in closing our eyes to these evils, and working on by the side of such persons, as though, in all essential matters, we were of one mind, and one heart with them, whilst in reality our tastes, feelings, and principles are diametrically opposed to those which they profess, and still more perhaps to those which they secretly entertain.

We do not wish to write bitterly; we are free to acknowledge that there is some measure of good in these very men, some degree of earnestness and devotion; there is nothing we desire more than to be able to enrol them in our Anglican ranks: but how *can* we do this, whilst their tastes and predilections are so manifestly Roman? whilst their favourite books of devotion are Roman? whilst their standard of piety is Roman? whilst their hearts are Roman, we will not say; but it requires some charity to forbear to think it. We can make allowances for a morbid and fastidious taste, the growth of nineteenth-century-refinement, which may shrink from the use of all hard words, however needful, towards any adversary, and persuade itself that controversy is ungentlemanly and a bore. We feel the influence of this spirit of pseudo-liberality ourselves; but we think it our duty to strive against and not encourage it; not to lull ourselves in dreams of Catholic unity, while Rome is at the gates, denouncing and denying our existence, and claiming our and our fathers' spiritual heritage. Doubtless the battle is to be fought and won by action rather than by agitation, by parochial work rather than by vehement controversy: daily services, open churches, pastoral visitation from house to house, direct communication betwixt pastor and people, these are the sacred weapons which will best bestead us in the strife, if they be accompanied, or rather leavened, by the faithful preaching and setting forth of Christ crucified; for without this, the most

earnest efforts will be certain to meet with disappointment: yet *silence* in the presence of such an adversary cannot be seemly; though we would not meet taunt with taunt, or menace with menace, yet the plain truth must be set before the minds of our people, and the great distinction betwixt Catholic faith and Roman error must be unceasingly held fast. And if we wish to be understood by those we speak to on this subject, we must not mince matters; we must call creature-worship what it is, idolatry, and idolatry we must sternly condemn. We must not allow the force of the second commandment to be pared away, we must maintain its perpetual binding obligation on all God's reasonable creatures. We must speak of the exorbitant pretensions of Rome with that abhorrence with which they would naturally inspire an ingenuous mind and heart. Above all, and on this point we would dwell as being most likely to be questioned, we must point out the injurious tendency of morbid ascetic cravings, which would persuade us to serve God, not in the world, but as far as possible out of it, and would lead us to isolation, absorbed in selfish cares for our own personal gain and glory, instead of living for "the brethren" as well as for ourselves, and endeavouring to serve our Maker, whilst we labour amongst our fellow-men. If we would resist Rome, we say, successfully, we *must* set our faces against this most fatal, most injurious *sentimental asceticism*, which represents the devil virtually as the lord of earth, though our Lord told his disciples that the prince of the powers of the air should be cast out, when He rose to lead captivity captive;—asceticism which is fatal in its effects to the elevation and the purification of social life; which, wherever it has received its full development, as in Spain and Italy, has been found to sap the very life-juice of the forest, to arrest the progress of civilization, to foster the grossest superstition, and to prostrate the heart and intellect beneath an iron yoke of bondage.

Many good men, with whom we sympathize on other points, are, we think, deceived in this matter; and that one error may too easily lead to others yet more serious. For, if the "ascetic" be really the highest life, if the very monks and nuns, whose devotion to the Virgin is so intense and glowing, be also the loftiest saints in the Christian calendar, how difficult, nay, how next to impossible would it seem, to hold that the peculiar forms of devotion which the ascetic life seems most to foster, should be utterly hostile to the will of Heaven! Doubtless, as Isaac Williams tells us, he who from his intense admiration for the ancient Church, has also been led to cherish no little sympathy with asceticism—the combination of energetic, earnest, real devotion with idolatry is Satan's masterpiece; is the great mystery of

iniquity which we were taught to expect. Our readers are probably familiar with those most striking lines in his magnificent work, "the Baptistry," which thus at once commemorate Rome's glory and Rome's shame: we will extract them as bearing closely on our argument:—

2.

" O mystery of mysteries !
 O Salem worthy of a Saviour's tears !
 For what are these idolatries
 Nursed in thy hidden courts and open skies ?
 Is this the city of the light where this black pall appears ?
 That he who runs may read on thee
 Something of fearful mystery !

3.

" Then art thou that dread Power on seven hills,
 Where deep imbedded, 'neath ancestral halls,
 The air some monster dread with foul contagion fills ?
 Where evil spirits haunt the walls,
 And the old Serpent finds a home,
 And hides him in the relics dark of old imperial Rome ?
 There coil'd beneath that ancient capitol
 Doth he again his deadly length unrol,
 The woman's seed in his embrace to fold,
 A deeper empire still in souls of men to hold ?
 Ev'n so proclaims th' unnumber'd tongue,
 The flowing years along.

4.

" O mystery of mysteries !
*For where hath e'er Devotion drank so deep
 Of penitential sighs ?
 Where with so grave a tone hath true Love learn'd to weep ?*
 Can Antichrist so oft to prayer and vigil call,
 And with the depths of holiness the sinner's heart appal ?

• • • •

7.

" Wonderful sight for good or ill !
 Whose very name men's deepest hearts doth thrill
 For love or hate :—
 She seems the judgment of our God to wait.—
 O keep me, Christ, to gaze upon this mystery,
 And yet unharmed pass by :
 Where Thou hast set to do Thy secret will,
 Bidding me in Thine own appointed state
 Await Thy sentence, and be still.

8.

" I will not speak of thee with scorn,
Lest I Christ's very Bride, the Ancient born,
Yea ! His own awful Spirit, have reviled.
I will not cease o'er thee to mourn,
Lest I with Christ's own foe at last be reconciled !"

Earnest and noble-hearted, and intensely truthful, is this utterance of our great Church-poet; more especially with regard to that marvellous combination of good and evil, which we acknowledge and deplore in Romanism: we hold it to be most true, though most mysterious, that an actual saint of God may offer idolatrous, and in itself most sinful worship to a creature; may build hay and stubble upon the One Foundation; may unconsciously promote a system of ecclesiastical wickedness and folly. And, therefore, we dispute not for a moment; God forbid that we should doubt—that thousands, and tens of thousands, of severe ascetics have not only been earnest but also loving Christians. We think it very possible to realize this fact; but still we apprehend that there will always be great danger of Christians who make Romish ascetic saints their devotional models, acquiring, by degrees, a taste for their peculiar devotions, and finding it more and more difficult to believe that the worship of such hearts and souls should be contrary to the will of God. Dr. Pusey seems an instance in himself that it is not impossible to unite this extreme veneration for ascetic saints with freedom from their peculiar errors. See, as an example, his singular preface to that singular book "*Surin's Foundations of the Spiritual Life*," wherein Ignatius Loyola, Francis of Assisi, Dominic, Catherine of Sienna, and others of the like stamp, are set before Christians of the English Church as guides and examples in the service of their God; and where morbid asceticism in the preface, as in the body of the work, is carried to the highest possible pitch of more than self-abnegation, we might almost say of self-annihilation. Yet Dr. Pusey repudiates the Roman worship of the Virgin-mother, a worship to which all these Roman saints, the objects of his intensest veneration, were so fervently attached, while, at page 8 of his preface, in a note, he expressly disclaims the right of "criticising any whom he knows to be saints of God." This does not mean, we presume, that he will not allow himself to criticise the belief, and words, and acts of saints, or supposed saints; but only that he will not criticise their motives: a task which we ourselves should be as fearful of undertaking.

But not to pursue this subject further, we do believe that the ascetic is not the highest Christian walk, and that those who en-

courage its development amongst ourselves are- consciously or unconsciously aiding and advancing the cause of Rome : we are ready to say with Robert Montgomery, in his noble work, " The Christian Life," which rises in our esteem and wins upon our admiration the more often we peruse it :—

" What self-born dangers aye infest
The man, who cloisters in monastic breast
Feelings and hopes, which God intends
As living cords to fasten friends .
In that sweet bond of unity and love
Form'd by the angels when they sing above !

" Sternly alone, forbid us, Lord ! to be ;
Warm our chill minds, and centre them on Thee :
Bought by one price, Thy precious blood,
And in Thy church a brotherhood,
With God's elected may we ever meet
In mystic access at Thy mercy-seat."

Before we discuss this subject, however, we shall further gratify ourselves by quoting one most valuable passage on asceticism from Mr. Edge's very beautiful " Vision of Peace," a poem already repeatedly commended in this review : the passage will scarcely bear abbreviation, but we are compelled to content ourselves with the following striking lines :—

" Asceticism is swoll'n with pride
Nor the least thwarting can abide.
True saintliness is ever meek,
And humbly, like a child, doth speak.
The former seems with wistful eye
To look on that old heresy,
Which long and blasphemously taught,
That matter never can be brought
Without destruction to the sight
Of God enshrined in living light ;
And, therefore, that the candidate
For an eternal, glorious state,
Must mortify malignant flesh,
Nor e'en its wasted powers refresh,
Save barely to maintain the strife
Of an exhausted ebbing life ;
That earthly duties, care and joy,
He must forego, and e'en employ
The powers for active service given
On idle baseless hopes of Heaven.—
The latter, sheltered in the thought
That God is into oneness brought

With human flesh, (before which, now
Angels in adoration bow,
When in celestial choirs they raise
To Heaven's Incarnate King their praise,)
And rather making it his aim
The carnal *heart* and *will* to tame
Than the mere *flesh*, doth freely use
God's gracious gifts; nor e'en refuse
In this, his pilgrimage, to cheer
His weary heart with friendship dear,
And sweet relationships bestowed
To help him on his heavenward road,"—pp. 32, 33.

We agree with the author of this beautiful poem, and willingly again repeat that asceticism, and the admiration for it, has operated as one of the chief attractions to Rome; and we are of opinion that it is the duty of all sound Anglicans in the present day, to encourage a more healthful and genial, and a less unsocial order of devotion. For,

"Earth needs the grace, and wants the beams,
Embodied grace imparts,
When worldlings view a valiant band
Maintain with life and heart and hand
The creed of sainted hearts."—*Christian Life*, p. 240.

But having thus mentioned Dr. Pusey and his peculiar position, together with some apparent inconsistency in his views and opinions, it may not be inappropriate to quote the following striking passage from the work before us, a passage as remarkable for the liberality, and, as we fondly hope, the justice of the sentiments expressed in it, as for the happiness of those expressions in themselves. It occurs in the course of a conversation betwixt "Algernon Seymour," a model Churchman, and one of our author's leading characters, keenly alive to the errors of Rome and the follies and mischievous tendencies of Tractarianism, and his friend and cousin "Edward Ellerton," also a sound Churchman in the main, but with a few "Tractite" predilections. They have been discussing the views and notions of the so-called "Oxford school" confidentially. Seymour is severe, and at last Ellerton exclaims,

" ' Well, but you cannot mean to doubt the holiness of Cattley ! ' "

" ' No. I believe Cattley to be an actual living saint; one who might have done honour to the holiest age of primitive Christianity. ' "

" ' You do not, then, think *him* at least unfaithful to the Church ? ' "

" ' Certainly not; I believe him to be very injudicious, but not unfaithful. I look upon his leaving us as a physical impossibility. & "

believe that he neither has now, nor ever has had, the slightest intention, or hesitation, or scruple on the subject: nay, I believe, that if through any unforeseen and unimaginable combination of circumstance, he were to waver, God would interpose his special providence, and remove him by sudden death from the evil to come, the evil of apostasy.'"—Vol. I. pp. 163, 164.

We do not think that the conviction here expressed is an unreasonable one. for surely it is impossible to believe that any true saint of God should be *allowed* to apostatize from the pure and Catholic faith and its profession, to a state of servitude to the monstrous errors of Rome: the divine promises do not seem consistent with such a possibility. We can understand how saints may exist within that Church who have been trained to the profession of error from their early childhood, in whose cases idolatrous practices and a devotional spirit have almost inextricably interwoven their roots and fibres: but how are we to conceive with the most abundant charity, that a Christian, under the influence of God's Holy Spirit, should exchange truth for falsehood, light for darkness, liberty for bondage? should sink from the worship of the One True God to the sternly forbidden and idolatrous adoration of his creatures? Surely the least that can be said of the spiritual state of such a pervert (*save, it may be, in extraordinary cases of weakness*) is, that, if not altogether under the sway of the wicked one, he must have become in no small degree subject to his influence; such subjection being the probable result of indulgence in some one course of sin; some cherishing of a favourite and secret iniquity, whether pride, or envy, or lust, or discontent. It may not become us to inquire curiously in particular cases into the direct immediate causes of such apostasy; but assuredly, a morbid asceticism, indulged until bitterness and spiritual pride become its fearful fruits, until love for man is first extinguished, and afterwards true love for God as well, is not amongst the least of such causes. For those whom it concerns, and who may chance to see this warning (though it is the unfortunate habit of this order of men, to peruse nothing but their own party organs, to allow themselves to read no syllable which could in any way grate upon their nerves; and this morbid sensitiveness, this reluctance to looking any objections straight in the face, this tendency to cry out that they are *hurt* when any unwelcome truth is placed before them, is one of the most marked characteristics of the men), let them, we say, reflect seriously, and ask themselves seriously, whether they are not becoming gradually of a wholly different temper of mind from the meek and compassionate "Saviour of

sinners ;” let them ask themselves whether they are not growing more like those “saints” of whom Surin and Dr. Pusey tell us, who not only glory in reproaches, when it is their duty to bear them, but who also manifestly *seek* for them ; who desire to be hated, and not loved by their fellow-men (a craving represented, alas ! as a mark of a saintly temper), who regard all the purest natural and social affections as a part of the evil world, as necessarily coming betwixt the soul and Christ ; who, in fine, hand over this world and all its interests to the wicked one, and make it the one sole object of their lives, not to promote God’s glory, but to secure their own salvation, by a series of voluntary and self-inflicted tortures ; to render life and earth and their own being hateful to them, so that Christ may be *of necessity* all in all. O most melancholy, O most fatal, of all spiritual delusions ! O sad perversion of the true doctrine of Christ crucified !

But to return. The sequel of the conversation betwixt Algernon Seymour and Edward Ellerton, of which we have given a small sample, has too much point, and too much truth, alas ! not fitly to find a place in this Review. Ellerton then responds thus to his friend’s eulogium of a certain leader :—

“ ‘ Well ! but if Cattley is so very holy, surely the school which produces such fruit cannot be worthy of such very stern condemnation.’ ”

“ ‘ Plausible, very plausible, but quite fallacious. Cattley is the product of the Church of England, not of the school which is called after him. He may in some sort have produced the school, in some sort only ; but assuredly the school did not produce him. Its fruits are to be seen not in the lives of its founders—especially where those lives accord with previous teaching, and are the natural result of its due reception—but in the character and conduct of its *disciples* : and you cannot compare the muling, puling, effeminate devotion, the wavering mind, the doubtful purpose of the bulk of its disciples, with the manly fervour, the simple faith, the sterling honesty of the genuine offspring of our Church. To me, in almost all of them there is an indescribable mannerism quite as offensive to good sense and good taste, quite as revolting to my English instincts, as the cant of the conventicle. Besides which, my dear Edward, granting the party in question every possible advantage deducible from the exemplary piety of Cattley, I must again refer you to the authority already cited, and remind you that ‘ *one swallow does not make a summer.*’ Cattley is assuredly no better than Bickersteth, whom I also love, and honour, and revere, as one of God’s own saints. Such things are, and are intended to be, a trial to our faith.”—Vol. i. pp. 164, 165.

We suspect that our readers will be already convinced that it is no ordinary mind which has undertaken to give us the fruits of its experience in these volumes. But perhaps our remarks thus

far may be calculated to produce an erroneous impression as to the nature of this singular work, which is a really very interesting tale, fraught with many highly-wrought adventures, and what we may even call romantic incidents, and characterized by much dry humour and keen powers of observation. There are, we think, rather too many characters, and the light and shade of the book are perhaps too abruptly contrasted with each other. Into its social views and purposes we shall not enter; we sympathize with them in the main, but consider our author somewhat of an enthusiast in his advocacy of social reformation. He is a great stickler all the while for the hereditary virtues of old blood; it is only mere rank, apart from family, and overbearing moneyocracy which incur the weight of his displeasure. The vulgarians of society, Sir John and Lady Thurtle, whom he introduces to us, are drawn from the life. We shall not attempt to forestall the pleasure of the reader by tracing the progress of the plot: suffice it to say, that it is ingenious, and well calculated for its author's purpose, which is, apparently, to cause to pass before us certain of the representatives of the various classes of modern life, both high and low, with a more especial reference to existing parties in the Church; and the result is a very stirring narrative, which can scarcely fail to excite, to enliven, to exasperate, and, in many cases, we may add, to edify. Mr. Bandinel's style is singularly clear and pellucid, as in his beautiful poem of "Lufra," of late commended by us; at times almost too simple and too confidential; so much so, indeed, as almost to incur the charge of puerility; yet his earnestness must, on the whole, we should say, command the respect, if not the regard, of *all* his earnest-minded readers. The heroine of the tale, Clara Pandolfi Davenant, child of an Italian mother and an English father, has a strongly-marked and a very interesting individuality. It may not be amiss to cite her first introduction to the tale, as a sample of Mr. Bandinel's descriptive powers:—

"All eyes were now fixed upon the stranger, whose name told at once the sad tale of her past history—her uncle's estrangement, her father's ruin, her mother's death, her own bereaved solitude.

"And they who once looked upon Clara, were not likely to remove their eyes for some time at least. She appeared to be about nineteen years of age. Her form was just above the middle height, and cast in that perfect mould of graceful symmetry and commanding beauty, which, though instanced elsewhere, seems more especially appropriate to the most favoured children of the *ancienne haute noblesse*. Her complexion was that of a clear brunette, which under happier circumstances would have displayed the rich though mellowed hues of the damask rose, but was now almost lividly pale; and from beneath a brow that

would have become a Zenobia shone her large lustrous eyes—eyes where the stern pride of her Norman lineage mingled with the intense fire of Italy. . . . Her queenly figure, her melancholy but magnificent beauty, riveted every eye, as, with slow and firm step, she paced the vast hall of her ancestors: all marvelled at the grave and deferential courtesy with which the man of law saluted her; all stood aghast, in speechless consternation, as he conducted the homeless orphan to the sacred dais, and placed her in the chair of state.”—Vol. ii. pp. 36—38.

But we must pass from such scenes to others of this work, which are more germane to our present humour; and that is, in a word, to avail ourselves of our author's graphic illustrations of *the clerical character* as it now exists, and to offer a few observations of our own there anent as we proceed. The Rev. Walpole Snoreham, then, to begin with the beginning, Rector of Milton, is only too happily and successfully portrayed: the generation of his like is, we trust, speedily passing away—men, with whom respectability is the *summum bonum*,—men, of whose working it can be said with truth, that, “as far as the parishioners of — were concerned, the church assumed the aspect of the world, and their spiritual pastor personified the pride of life.” This gentleman's deportment in his desk and pulpit is thus quaintly and characteristically portrayed:—

“And Snoreham commenced the service in a stern, authoritative tone, looking at his congregation all the while as if he thought Sunday must be the proudest day of their lives, because they had the privilege of looking him, Walpole Snoreham, straight in the face; yet with a sort of indescribable something that seemed to say, that he was in his own mind quite sure that they did not deserve it. The prayers, too, he read with much austere dignity, as though he thought them fully applicable to the congregation, but rather derogatory to himself. And the sermon! One would have supposed, as perhaps was the case, that he looked upon this portion of his official duties as some men do on the whole of religion, as an affair exclusively between man and his Maker; since, whatever were the merits of his discourses, gleaned plentifully from Tillotson, Atterbury, and other divines of the same age, they were wholly unsuited, and for the most part unintelligible, to his congregation. But then he was, as I have before said, a fine-looking man; he dressed well, held himself well, had a good, and what agriculturists like still better, a loud voice, and a decidedly commanding presence; which in some degree accounted for the numbers which, in spite of the ceaseless efforts of dissenting emissaries, still frequented his church. Though the real reason of this was that earnest, true-hearted loyalty, which the vast, the overwhelming majority of Englishmen still feel to their fathers' Church, their fathers' Faith, and their fathers' God.”—Vol. i. pp. 237, 238.

Passing from the Rev. Walpole Snoreham to a very different specimen of the English clergy, we will proceed at once to make another extract, which will, we think, speak for itself:—

“ Presently Mr. Smedley himself came in, and nothing could be kept from him ; so he, too, wished Algernon joy. And there were few people, and neither Algernon nor Mary were of the number, who did not find his good wishes worth having. In fact, he belonged to that most estimable, and therefore most reviled class,—the real strength of our Church, the real stamina of our country, the only safe guides of our people,—the orthodox clergy of the Church of England ; men who, instead of preaching *about* the Gospel or the Church, preach *in accordance with them*, which is a very different thing. He had heard or read somewhere, that ‘ where there is much show in the window, there is seldom much stuff in the store ; ’ a sentiment which approved itself to his thoroughly English feelings. Nay, on one occasion he had greatly astounded two noisy disputants by observing, that though the writers of the New Testament were, without doubt, both ‘ Catholic ’ and ‘ Evangelical,’ they had strangely enough never designated themselves by either appellation. For his own part, he endeavoured, like the inspired preachers of Christianity, to unfold to his people the whole counsel of God ; whilst, in his character both of a pastor and a neighbour, he sought humbly to follow in His steps who went about doing good. As he did not, however, sound a trumpet before him, and took pains to prevent any one from doing that office for him, he was never heard of beyond his own quiet parish, except by those who became unexpectedly his debtors by some act of disinterested kindness. In short, like most of his brethren, he understood literally and obeyed scrupulously the command, ‘ Let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth.’ ”—
Vol. i. pp. 215—217.

An admirable contrast to this full-length portraiture is supplied in the graphic sketch of the Rev. Charon Showtheway. But here we feel that a long extract is called for to do any justice to our author ; and, indeed, we think that our readers will thank us heartily for placing the following admirable pages before them ; they are fraught with the soundest practical wisdom, and contain warnings most essential for these days, the Didymus Dykes, of which (Dyke, as will be seen, is a well-meaning *waverer*,) are unhappily so very numerous:—

“ Didymus Dyke was, then, one of that unhappy class of men, of whom there are too many at present, who, with a certain acuteness of intellect and sensitiveness of imagination, have received a good deal of education, *so-called*, but very little mental and still less moral training. He had never been taught to regulate his *better* feelings, to rein his fancy, to distrust his intellectual faculties ; much less had the notion ever been presented to his mind, that conscience, though the highest and holiest of our faculties, requires instruction and enlightenment, ay,

and training too, as assuredly as any of the others. It seemed never to have occurred to him (as it seems never to have occurred to many others), that although, when all the higher faculties are left to fish for themselves, conscience may exert and will exert her native supremacy; yet, if the other faculties are, so to speak, bred to the use, and accustomed to the exercise, and endowed with the possession of arms, whilst conscience is alone left to herself, she will become the prey of the strongest. . . . And this is still more strongly and wofully felt when her favourite playmates, her bosom friends, judgment and common sense, have been equally neglected. People have a very silly notion that these three worthies can take care of themselves. So they may, in a less artificial state of things, but such is not the case in our present world: the very education which increases the power of the other faculties, deprives these of a portion of their native energy, unless they, too, are cared for: *the sap that should have fed their boughs, and filled their fruit, goes to adorn their companion branches with a fine show of green leaves.* . . . Didymus Dyke, too, had received no definite, dogmatic teaching in religious matters. He was not well acquainted with the Sacred Volume, and still less versed in ecclesiastical history, though he had been accustomed, from his youth up, to read his Bible and attend his church; but both operations partook, in a great degree, of the character of mechanical habits. Then Didymus Dyke had imbibed a certain quantity of that pseudo-philosophic tone and pseudo-philanthropic temper, which those who are unacquainted with the proper use of language are in the habit of terming *liberal* and *enlightened*: a title to which they have about as much claim as the songsters of Islington to that of nightingales. In common with many other well-disposed young gentlemen, Didymus Dyke had a most tremendous fear of being behind his age. He would scarcely have ventured to call his nose his own, had any one very strongly asserted the contrary, and would, if placed upon a jury, have acquitted every criminal on the plea of insanity, and suggested the erection of a laudatory tablet to the highwayman or wife-slayer who pleaded conscientious motives. In fact, he was a very nice young man, amiable, intelligent, with a good deal of sentiment, and so *very* impartial and candid: some called him 'a dear young man;' others thought him 'a perfect love;' every one, with the exception of a few bigots, thought that he was just suited for a clergyman. So Didymus Dyke, after reading with a clerical tutor for six months, *did* take orders. The clerical tutor was a very excellent man in his way, but not equal to the very difficult task of grafting-in moral and mental training upon the mind of a highly-educated and full-grown man. His sympathies were decidedly in favour of that party which is frequently designated from its supposed conformity to the principles advocated in the 'Tracts for the Times.' It was not that Mr. Bray had any real tendencies towards the distinctive doctrines of the party in question, much less to those of their cousins the Romanizers: but Bray called himself, and thought himself 'a sound Churchman;' and he took it into his poor head, that 'the Ox-

ford men,' as he called them, were the real representatives of Church principles, and their followers the main strength of the High Church party: and so he gave them the weight and the support of his name and influence, whatever they might be worth. . . . So Didymus Dyke, who had previously to his going to Mr. Bray's become acquainted with several attractive members of the school already indicated, proceeded during his half-year's reading in the same direction, and entered upon his duties as a clergyman with a decided leaning towards the teaching of 'the Oxford writers.' Had he gone at this time to a quiet country curacy, or been placed under, and working with men whose views accorded with those of that Church whose ministers under God they are, all might have been well; nay, had he formed an intimacy with a '*Christian Evangelical*,' he might still have been kept straight. Such, however, was not his lot: he was placed in an arduous post in a large city. The rector was, from overwork, obliged to travel: the head curate was a hard-working High Churchman, who, like Mr. Bray, had a tenderness for the class of men already indicated: his preaching was neither spiritual nor Evangelical, in the true sense of those words, and he had neither time, inclination, nor capacity to guide his assistant. There were those, however, who had all; for in the next parish was established a powerful body of—What shall I say? I do not like to call names, so I will fain coin a very inoffensive appellation, and say that the people in question were *Directionists*, *Directionists* of the first water. Every man, woman, and child belonging to, or connected with, the Church of St. Anacletus, was under *Spiritual Direction*: some of them had one Spiritual Director, and some another; but each had his, her, or its own. They believed in their hearts, that the system was universally, essentially, and individually necessary to salvation; and they acted up to their belief."—Vol. ii. pp. 216—223.

We would interpose a doubt whether there is any Church in which the system of Spiritual Direction has been carried out to such an extent as this, with the exception of St. Saviour's at Leeds. We do not imagine, at least, that such an assertion could be made with truth of any church in the metropolis.

"It was an evil day when poor Didymus Dyke found upon his table a card, with the inscription 'The Rev. Charon Showtheway.' Many had been the souls which the gentleman in question had ferried over to the other side of that stream which separates the living from the dead; but still, somehow or other, he was always found at his post on the English side of the Channel, though he had somewhat of a gloomy and even ghostly appearance, which gave you the idea that his right place was not among the living. Don't let it be, however, supposed that I mean to say any thing against the honesty or honourable dealing of the gentleman in question; he never picked a pocket, or stole a horse, or passed a bad shilling in all his life. Nevertheless, Didymus

Dyke did not derive that benefit from his society and that of his associates which might have been expected. Didymus had been taught that it was illiberal and uncharitable to call any body or thing by his or its right name, if the party most interested objected or demurred to the appellation. With him it was a fundamental article of faith, that even the devil is not so black as he is painted, and there was, therefore, no difficulty in persuading him that he had been mistaken in condemning the Church of Rome ; it was a more enlightened, a more enlarged view, he thought, to acquit her of the crimes and errors laid to her charge ; so he hugged himself in the consciousness of an enlarged mind, and looked down with ineffable contempt upon ' Protestant prejudice,' as being wholly unworthy of the nineteenth century. Then, again, Didymus, never having received any principles, properly so called, nor any dogmatic teaching, nor having been morally and mentally trained so as to judge for himself, was ready to listen to those who, whilst appealing to his feelings and his imagination, and having a strong hold upon his higher and deeper sympathies, undertook to solve all difficulties, determine all questions, by a simple appeal to authority, the authority they said of the Church, though where that authority was vested, and how it was to be exercised, he was never very clearly told. On went poor Didymus, groping and stumbling along in the dark, till suddenly, quite suddenly, the conviction burst upon him that he was on the way to Rome. The notion was a great shock to him, a very great shock indeed, for he had not had the remotest idea of what he was doing ; and many reasons made him shudder at the step which he might have to take. It was not merely that he should have to resign all thoughts of that happy home to which he had so long looked forward. It was not merely the inevitable rupture of dear domestic ties, and the many painful consequences of a social character which distressed him ; nor the memories of other years, nor the force of early associations, rising like threatening ghosts to bar his progress. A vague, indefinite horror shrouded the future ; a strange, mysterious dread enveloped the present ; a mournful voice seemed ever ringing in his ears, warning him that he was falling under the influence of a strong delusion, and about to hazard the loss of his eternal salvation,—the wailing, it may be, of his guardian angel, mingling strangely with the chaotic sounds that troubled his rest, and tortured his soul, yet rising above them all with its deep doleful cry of bereavement and desolation. On finding how things were, Didymus went to his friend Charon to consult him on the general subject, and state his particular difficulties. ' It would be useless for me, in your present state, my dear young friend, to enter upon the discussion of any of those points which you have mentioned,' replied Showtheway. ' In fact, I feel myself perfectly unequal to determine any of them, nor do I occupy my mind at all with controversial questions ; of course, whatever the Catholic Church teaches we must hold, whatever she condemns we must renounce. I cannot help hoping ; indeed, I do firmly believe, that the Church of England is a true branch of the Church Catholic, and, as

such, I continue to minister at her altars; but I would not take upon me to condemn those who differ from me, and who, in obedience to their conscientious convictions, seek what appears to them the more excellent way. I should, however, advise you to dismiss such thoughts from your mind for the present, give yourself up to parochial work and private devotion for the next two years, availing yourself, in the mean time, of all the public means of grace, keeping yourself as much as possible out of the world, subjecting yourself to a severe penitential discipline, spending certain hours of each day in meditation on the five wounds or adoration of the Sacred Heart, and in all other ways endeavouring to raise yourself to the full stature of the Catholic standard of piety. At the end of that period you will be more capable of judging for yourself than either of us are now.' "—Vol. ii. pp. 223—228.

Then, too, there is the masterly delineation of the Jesuit Pym, a pervert from our Church, and an unscrupulous worker in the cause of her, whom Newman not unfitly designated in his singular "Loss and Gain," as "the Mighty Mother;" St. John had fixed that appellation on her before him: Pym, who is so graphically portrayed as having "small, piercing, dark eyes, that seem to recede at times into his head, then to come forth stealthily, and then to return again," with "no beard or whiskers, and his jet black hair cropped so close as to remind one of the cut of a roundhead." From first to last the career of this worthy is most admirably developed, but we shall not attempt to trace the progress of his subtle feats and intricate machineries: we will confine ourselves to the extraction of a very remarkable passage, describing his sermons, at a time when being already a Papist, he nevertheless occupies for some weeks the pulpit of an invalided clergyman of the Church of England, no other than the Rev. Walpole Snoreham:—

"They are somewhat peculiar discourses; part of them extremely plain and practical, part of them of a highly mysterious character. Those who admire them say that they combine the utmost simplicity with the deepest spirituality. Selina" (a Calvinistic young lady) "is delighted ever and anon by passionate rhapsodies, in which the highest and holiest things are treated of in by turns the most exalted and familiar language. He delights the Dissenters" (this is in a country parish) "by his frequent use of the holy name coupled with epithets of endearment, in a manner which altogether sacrifices reverence to rapture. He of course carefully avoids all, the most distant, allusion to the distinctive doctrines of the English Church, or the distinctive errors of the Roman communion; and this he does in such a way as to convey the direct impression that neither of them have any existence. He delights in preaching, for example, against idolatry, and urges the sin and danger of covetousness, telling his auditors that

avarice is under the Gospel what image-worship was under the Law ; and in the same way he treats all subjects similarly circumstanced. And the general effect of his sermons upon those who ' appreciate and enter into them,' is to leave the heart in a fervour of animal piety, and the mind in a maze of half-pleasing, half-painful bewilderment, producing in the soul a sense of keen rapture, accompanied with a vague yet fervent longing for the fuller enjoyment of its at present only partially developed ecstasy. Now and then, however, he preaches sermons of a sterner material, which awe the mind by their still and solemn power, yet kindle indefinite and undefinable aspirations after something mystical and intangible : and once or twice he volunteers a discourse on the evidences of religion in general and Christianity in particular, suggestive of doubts and difficulties hitherto unknown by those whom he addresses, and leaving on the mind an impression, that, although the Christian revelation may be true, and probably is so, it is a very hard thing to understand."—Vol. i. pp. 291—293.

We have said that we should not attempt to follow the changing fortunes of this interesting tale ; but we think we ought not to omit giving one or two samples of our author's lighter style, where he is not dealing with directly religious topics. The following passage exhibits, we should say, much dramatic skill, and combines a quaintness of expression with a serio-comic humour, which may, we fear, lose somewhat of their effect by the separation of the passage from the context. Pym, the Jesuit guest, and the Rev. Walpole Snoreham's daughters, are summoned to his sick chamber by a cry, and there they find a horrible old woman, called Eleanor Norman, a Dorsetshire peasant, laying out his dead body : the countenance of the deceased bears the impress of some fierce internal struggle :—

" ' Miserable wretch,' said Pym, ' you have murdered him !'

" ' No, I ha'en't, sir ; *I* never murders no one. And if you'll just leave me alone, I'll tell these here ladies, and all the rest on 'em, how their pa come to his end. Would ye like to hear it now, or wait till the 'sizes ?'

" ' Speak on !'

" ' Well, I've always taken a great interest in this here parson ever since he sent my boy to Axcester gaol for coting a pheasant for me when I was ill in bed. I thought it was so kind and considerate of 'm, particular just after my poor Nelly's death. And I've always told him how Job was a gitting on. And I was so thankful to him when he got him transported : travelled I don't know how many miles to bear witness to his character, when judge and jury was a going to let him off. And I've often had a talk with him since then, dear old gentleman ! and I—— but never mind. Well, at last I got the certificate of Job's death—dead of a jail fever out in one of they outlandish places ; for he went from bad to worse, poor fellow ! owing to the parson's

kindness: for he wrote, so I heer'd say, out there about him. And I met him t'other day, just afore they rollicky young chaps was here as is going to marry the young ladies, and I has a bit of talk with him, and he tries to get rid of me; but I keeps up with him till he gets here, and puts him into a bit of a fluster.

" ' Well, I knew his end was a coming, never you mind how; but I knew it as sure as you stand there. And I thinks I should just like to have another chat with him. So I come here, and creepy, creepy under the hedge, and in at the study window, as was open for fresh air, I s'pose; and creepy, creepy up stairs, and into this room. And I crawlys under the bed, and waits till Deborah was gone for a minute or two; and then, as she shuts the door, he wakes and turns, and I says, ' Here I be, parson,' and gets up, and looks at him; and he looks much more better like and reasonable like than I expected: I s'pose the complaint was a turning. So says I again, ' How d'ye do, parson? Have ye seen my boy yet?' And he looks strange and fierce like at me, and tells me to leave him. ' Lord love ye,' says I, ' I shall never leave ye more!' ' What do you mean?' says he. I doesn't wish to make a noise; so I looks at him so, grinning like, and puts my face down over him, and says, ' Why, Lord love ye, parson! don't you know that you be dead and buried, and that you and I be in Hell?' So he looks a bit camstrary like at that, and I nods, and nods, and nods agin at him. And he tries to say something, and clenches his hands, and looks as though he would kill me if he could; and he opens his mouth, and closes it again two or three times; and then there comes a rattle in his throat, and a sharp stop, and I knows it's all over with old Snoreham!"—Vol. i. pp. 301—304.

Of the various love passages we have not space to cull samples, but there is one very striking and very beautiful passage in the second volume, respecting a certain crisis in the life of a young man of fashion, Lord Ducandraque, which we must manage to find room for, premising however that the adventures of this nobleman and his friend, a model clergyman, the Rev. Clarence Porter, though cleverly portrayed, are what we like least in the book. Some expressions are used by these worthies, which however natural upon their lips, might just as well not be repeated by others; there is nothing indeed in Milton Davenant which we should object to a wife or a sister or a daughter's reading; but still even the bare appearance of evil, or of what can be possibly construed as evil, is objectionable, if only as giving a handle to the enemy. But to proceed with our promised extract:—

" He soon reached the water's edge; and as he strolled along the solitary beach, and listened unconsciously to the eternal voice of the deep waters, falling in mournful music on the sand, or looked over the dark wave to the darker horizon, or cast his eyes upward to the blue vault of heaven, so brightly dark in its unfathomable depth of ether, or

marked the moon slowly rising to her lofty zenith, and throwing her mantle of silver over land and sea, or turned to mark the long white line of cliff, with the dark green land above and behind,—strange, indistinct imaginings stole over him; a something seemed to whisper in his ear, that he was made for higher, nobler aims than those which he had hitherto followed; earth, sky, and sea seemed inutely to plead for his soul; nay, he could almost fancy that inner voices syllabled his name, that some benignant being called him to return.

“ ‘No, no!’ he cried, as if answering some invisible companion; ‘it is too late *now*! I might have been different from what I am *once*: I know that. But what is the good of thinking about that now?’ And he dashed his foot passionately on the ground.

“ Was it the groan of mortal being, or the low moan of the distant waves? or was it something yet more shadowy, though not less real,—some voice from that mysterious spirit-world with which we are so closely though invisibly connected?

“ The Earl of Ducandraque starts; he strains his eyes with almost ghastly intensity, as he strives to penetrate the dim shadows that fall from yonder headland on the heaving flood, then draws a long deep breath, and ejaculates, ‘Poor Margaret!’”—Vol. ii. pp. 18, 19.

This is a strain of really energetic prose-poetry, and it is something far better, too, for it is replete with a deep spiritual significance, and could only flow from the pen of one who had himself realized, in no small measure, communion with the world of spirits. But we feel that our extracts have already extended to such a length, that although we have by no means satisfied ourselves in the execution of our task, though we feel that we have not cited those passages which are calculated to be most extensively popular, or even to work most lasting good, yet we must refrain from heaping citations on citations, and leave our readers to discover many beauties for themselves.

We will not deny that Mr. Bandinel has laid himself open to animadversion on some scores; he has introduced words (see more particularly the opening of chapter lxxv. in the third volume) which we think he would have acted more wisely in suggesting only; here and there he has used colloquial expressions of a low order, which we look upon as blots, such as the three words “cut his stick,” instead of “took to flight,” on page 178 of the same volume. In themselves these things are but slight drawbacks to the value of this book, but they will be, and have been, welcomed with great joy by the adversary, and converted into weapons of assault on their unsuspecting author. Appeals will be made, and have been made, to men’s *taste* to think but lightly of Mr. Bandinel’s work, and possibly to despise and neglect it altogether. We can well conceive how anxious a certain faction must be to strangle such a production in its birth; but

the intrinsic worth, and power, and interest of the book will be too much for them; the many beautiful ideas which are scattered through its pages must win sympathy and admiration; the open honesty, the unshrinking boldness, the unswerving self-consistency, the noble and unmistakeable churchmanship of the author, all speak for themselves, and will win many an enthusiastic adherent to the cause which he advocates. The genuine power of sarcasm, the biting wit and humour, which form two of the leading characteristics of "*Milton Davenant*," are certain to command an audience, if nothing else could; while the strong sympathy with the people, and courageous advocacy of social progress, and warm defence of the rights of that most important and long-neglected body, the middle classes, which will be found there, will endear the book to thousands of readers, and call forth, we doubt not, many more enthusiastic eulogies than ours. We shall not be able to prevail upon ourselves to conclude without gathering a nosegay of beautiful thoughts and images from various parts of these delightful volumes, and, being pressed for time, we must make our selections rather at a venture. To commence with a very striking and serious observation:—

"Why should not people enjoy themselves? I am sure that *I* see no reason, so long as their enjoyments are lawful, in kind and in degree, in themselves and in their effects; so long as they are hurtful neither to body or soul; so long as they do not engross their minds, or distract their attention from other things—higher or holier things—the duty and the business of life. . . . If you are without duties, and without business, that is, without the consciousness of duty, or the habit of business, then you are without God. . . . Even in Paradise man was not meant to be idle, nor woman either; for we are told that 'the Lord God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden, *to dress it and to keep it*. . . . And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him an *HELP* meet for him;' that is to say, that from the beginning man was created to do his work, and woman to help him to do it. Yes! work is the law of the creation; the condition of existence; the type of God's relation to the universe, of *spirit* to *matter*; the emblematic sign of the office of the eternal Son. Work is honour, idleness is shame; work is the mode and the vehicle of salvation, idleness the symptom, the seal, the assignment, and the assurance of the second death."—Vol. i. pp. 193, 194.

From an admirable description of an exceedingly Calvinistic and an ultra-tractarian young lady, we extract only the following concluding morsel; the sly observation betwixt the brackets is inimitable:—

Sophronia "had thought of appointing her old preceptor, the Rev. Silas Silliman, as *Spiritual Director* to her dear girls, but he has

gone over to Rome, (what a sad thing that we should lose all our best and holiest!) so she will propose the matter to Mr. Pym."—Vol. i. p. 234.

Here is a very beautiful description of a winter's day.

"It was a lovely day, though late in December; one of those days which we have not unfrequently in the West of England at that time of year; when the west wind is hushed, and the air is soft to the touch, and silvery to the sight, and here and there a misty veil hangs over wood or stream; whilst the rest of the scene smiles in a glad though subdued light, and the hill-tops strike against the deep blue sky. There is a stillness, a repose about such a day, that has all the quiet, with none of the gloom or terror of the grave. It seems like the tranquil rest of the holy departed, of the blessed that die in the Lord in sure and certain hope of a joyful resurrection."—Vol. i. pp. 262, 263.

Nor must we fail to cite an exquisite image from a parallel passage in the third volume.

"The sun was declining, but his rays poured with undiminished glory upon hill and valley; that chastened kindly glory which the sun puts on as Christmas approaches, as though he felt constrained to humble himself before the rising of the Sun of Righteousness."

Here, again, is an admirable touch, extracted from an onslaught on conventionalism:—

"Had not the young ladies been brought up to consider their exclusive position as the greatest, noblest, highest of heaven's gifts, a thing actually of divine appointment, which it would be a sin akin to that of Esau to surrender, a crime little, if any thing, inferior to sacrilege to invade? And there was Robert Da'enant actually sitting on one of those chairs set apart for the sacred Few; he was sitting at that table never before approached but by the select presentables; he was, too, under the auspices of Pym, eating a biscuit, drinking a glass of wine. It was an awful, a harrowing sight."—Vol. i. pp. 283, 284.

The following tribute to the merit of one of the Church's most valuable sons, and most active servants should not be omitted from such a "catena" as we are here presenting to the reader.

"At a large round library table . . . sits a man passed, but not long passed, the meridian of life. He is one whom those that wish to bring our Church into bondage to Rome hate with a deadly hatred. Gentle and loving, and forbearing almost to excess, as these men sometimes are upon ordinary occasions, the meekest countenance amongst them assumes a decidedly unamiable expression when his name is mentioned. A little honesty, a little soundness, may be borne with, even in an adversary; but they feel the union, the fulness of these in one man, and that man one of their most determined opponents, to be utterly

unbearable, a downright personal affront to themselves ; and combined, as these qualities are in the present instance, with zeal and courage, they become really formidable, and subject their possessor to be dealt with in such manner as may best further the interests of '*Catholic unity*.'"—Vol. ii. pp. 2, 3.

Masterly is the conversation of Askerswell with Pym, the concealed Jesuit, especially this characteristic passage :—

" ' Yes, yes,' rejoined Pym, ' every one must have the very highest respect for Mr. Pilgrim. The Church, as Dr. Cattley says, owes a great deal, a very great deal to Mr. Pilgrim.'—And John Pym looked with that amiable and loving look which might light up the countenance of an affectionate boa constrictor. . . . He had more than once noticed, that with some men, whilst it was a habit to speak with tender solicitude and admiring forbearance of the one, (Pilgrim,) as though bent upon killing him with kindness, as the saying is, it was equally habitual to treat the name of ' Brumath ' " (the worthy doctor referred to in the last extract,) " with undisguised and unmitigated abhorrence ; men whose looks and gestures seemed to fill up the defalcation of their words, and cry, ' Hit him hard ; he has no friends ; he is a stranger and a foreigner ; give him, therefore, no quarter ; shout *mad dog ! mad dog !* or any thing else to get rid of him.' "—Vol. ii. pp. 46, 47.

We cannot find space to extract the beautiful sketch of " a parson's wife," in the person of Laura Askerswell, though we should not treat our readers fairly in withholding from them its concluding paragraph :—

" Such was Laura Askerswell ; nor does she stand alone in her high and holy vocation, her devotion to her Saviour and her God ! for never till that awful day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be laid open, will man know what England owes to the wives and daughters of the orthodox clergy."—Vol. ii. pp. 80, 81.

The description of the good Evangelical clergyman, Obadiah Oliphant, one of the excellent of the earth, scarcely ought to be omitted, or the sarcastic remarks of our author there anent, respecting the necessity of hoarding up our charity for " the greatest Church of Christendom," and " men of Catholic sympathies." But we must pass on to the powerfully delineated interview at Rome betwixt Pym and the Superior of the Jesuits, though that also ought to be cited *in extenso*, if at all. We shall only make a single citation :—

" And as certain names were mentioned, the holy sign of the cross was profanely drawn over the false-hearted bosoms of the conspirators, whilst dark and terrible anathemas were muttered. I need not say that amongst those names were those of the Vicar of Leeds, the author of the '*Origines Liturgicæ*,' the writer of the '*Speculum Episcopi*,' and

the Doctor already alluded to ; nor was the same mode of commendation held back from a celebrated Canon of Westminster, and a no less celebrated *Curate* (shame on the patrons of England, still *but* a curate !) of Bisley."—Vol. ii. p. 169.

The chapters respecting Oxford are glowing with a noble enthusiasm, which will kindle many a drooping memory into fresh affection ; and we will venture to add, that the compliment to Mr. Parker is well deserved,—is, in fact, no compliment at all, but the bare assertion of a fact. The description of Mr. Askerswell's parish doings is very valuable ; the argument betwixt Dyke and Ellerton which occupies the better half of chapter xxxix. is almost invaluable. Let Romanizers and Romanists meet its conclusions if they can ! But the former are, ordinarily speaking, endowed with too plentiful a lack of brains to know when they are beaten ; and the former, whatever they may know or suspect, are bond-slaves to an iron system, which practically brands the light of human reason as "the accursed thing."

ART. V.—*Inner Africa laid open, in an attempt to trace the chief Lines of Communication across that Continent, south of the Equator ; with the routes to the Muropús and the Cazembe, Moenemoózi, and Lake Nyassa, &c.* By WILLIAM DESBOROUGH COOLEY. London: Longmans, 1852. [8vo. pp. 149.]

It is strange that Africa—though in the oldest authentic annals of the human race (those of the book of Genesis) it takes precedence immediately after Asia, that earliest seat of man both before and after the flood—should, even in the nineteenth century, be less known than either of its younger sisters, Europe, and the two Americas.

The course of the Niger has indeed been at length discovered by the intelligence of Laing, and the perseverance of Lander; and the limits of the *terra incognita* have, of late years, surely, though slowly, receded before the footsteps of scientific inquiry, commercial enterprise, and missionary zeal. Still, however, much remains unknown; much requires to be accomplished. The Nile still rises in regions untrodden by the foot, unseen by the eye,—impenetrable to the curiosity of the European;—and many a region must be explored, many a mountain ascended, many a river traced, many a problem solved, ere the geography of this mysterious continent takes its place amongst the realities of experimental science.

We rejoice, therefore, at the appearance of Mr. Cooley's volume; and without pledging ourselves to all his conclusions, either negative or positive, we gladly acknowledge that he has employed deep research and careful investigation in compiling the work now before us; that his facts are interesting, his reasoning logical, his style lucid and accurate, and the information which he has here brought together extremely valuable.

The portion of Africa which is here laid open is one that has hitherto excited comparatively small interest, and concerning which our information has been peculiarly scanty. It is that vast region which extends from the neighbourhood of the equator, in a southerly direction, to the northernmost limit of the Kaffir and Hottentot settlements; whilst it spans the breadth of the continent from east to west between the narrow coast lands possessed or influenced by Europeans.

The student of African geography will at once grant the truth

of our words, when we state that in no region of the earth has the imagination of theoretical geographers invented so many strange incongruities and palpable absurdities as in reference to the natural and artificial features of this vast continent. From the days of Ptolemy downward it would indeed seem to have occupied in topography the same place allotted to Limbo in the unseen world.

This universal law of African being has not been violated in the case of the tract which Mr. Cooley has endeavoured to illustrate; and a great part of his labour is occupied in clearing away the mistakes of the unwary, and the misstatements of the unprincipled. Whilst doing this, he endeavours carefully to establish the truth, and gives us a valuable map as the result of his labours.

"The interior of Africa," says he, "south of the equator, still remains, in our best maps, a blank; yet our information of that portion of the earth, scanty as it may appear, is sufficient, when aptly analyzed and combined, to shed a flood of light on a very interesting region. The chief physical features of that hitherto dark interior, and those most likely to operate on the social condition of mankind, may be made to shine forth with uncontrovertible evidence. To collect and duly concentrate every scattered ray of light, is the task herein undertaken. If successfully performed, it will invest with an authentic character much that is now involved in doubt and uncertainty; and, at the same time, it cannot fail to augment our knowledge with the consequences that follow on clear views. The first attempt of the kind was made in the 'Memoir on the Geography of Nyassi,' which appeared in the 'Journal of the Royal Geographical Society,' vol. xv. 1845. The novelty, extent, and intrinsic importance of the field therein opened to inquiry, would fully justify the repetition of its survey, even within the same limits; but we now resume its investigation with a wider scope, increased resources, and with a reasonable expectation which still hangs over the geography of Africa. The discoveries recently made in Eastern Africa by the missionaries settled near Mombas, will be also found here reduced to an authentic shape, and in their just proportions." —pp. 1, 2.

Amongst the many strange misconceptions which until late years prevailed respecting African geography, our readers will probably recollect—those of them who are old enough—how they were carefully taught to believe that the river Zaire, or Congo, as it is sometimes called, rose in some distant and unknown region far to the north of the equator; and in traversing the mysterious wildernesses of Central Africa, received the benefit of two rainy seasons. Some, if our memory does not fail us, identified this stream with that of the Niger; others gave it a less eccentric

route ; whilst not a few connected its imaginary fountains with those of the Nile. It is with the higher course of this river that Mr. Cooley is occupied in the early pages of the volume before us.

He has in the first instance to reduce certain exaggerated distances to their true value, and to ascertain the real position of some localities in the neighbourhood of the eastern coast. He then proceeds :—

“ In 1802, Franceso Honorato Da Costa, superintendent of the fair or factory of Casange, sent two Pombeiros¹, or native mercantile travellers, into the interior, with instructions to cross the continent, if possible, to the Zambeze. But a principal object of their mission was to endeavour to establish relations of amity and intercourse with the Muropúe, or king of the Moluas (as they are called by the Portuguese), who was known to dwell beyond Casange, towards the N.E. or N.N.E. The wily Jaga or chief of Casange, it appeared, was adverse to such direct intercourse, and had hitherto prevented the Moluas from visiting the coast, by representing the Portuguese as cannibals, risen from the sea. But as this engrossing, obstructive, or protective policy prevails universally in Africa, it was to be feared that the Muropúe would not allow the Pombeiros to pass eastwards or southwards through his dominions. They were instructed therefore to lay aside their mercantile character, and to represent themselves as envoys of Mueneputo (the king of Portugal), seeking their chief's brother, who had travelled into the interior some years before, and had not since been heard of. The person thus alluded to was Dr. Lucerda, who in 1798 conducted an expedition from Tete on the Zambeze to Lucenda, the residence of the Cazembe, where he died soon after his arrival.

“ The Pombeiros executed their undertaking, but experienced delays that showed its difficulty. At a distance of only eight days from the Portuguese limits, they met with obstructions from a petty chief. They pushed on, however, to Bomba, who effectually detained them above two years. Ransomed by Da Costa, they were allowed to depart ; and after paying another ransom to a chief, named Moshíco, they at length reached the Muropúe, or Muáta ya Nvo, or ya Mbo, in 1805. By him they appear to have been kindly treated ; and, continuing their journey without mishap, they arrived at Lucenda, the residence of the Cazembe, on the last day of 1806. Here they remained four years, prevented by wars from proceeding to Tete. At length, however, on the 2nd of February, 1811, they entered that town, were ill-received by the Portuguese authorities, and with very inadequate means, started on their return to Angola, where they arrived in 1815.”—pp. 8, 9.

Great indeed must be the energy, untiring the perseverance, and impregnable the patience of those who seek to explore the

¹ Pombeiro is the Portuguese derivative from the Bunda or Angolan word Pámbu, a route or journey.

interior of Africa. In this instance, we see thirteen years taken up in an expedition which elsewhere would not have occupied as many months. The memoranda of the Pombeiros are not very copious, but they are characterized by simplicity and veracity. From them, illustrated by other authorities, carefully collated, Mr. Cooley has elicited much curious and interesting information. We proceed to extract some of his results, leaving the reader to seek in the work itself the processes by which they were obtained.

“The starting point of the Pombeiros was the Mucari or domain containing the factory for Casange, within a day's journey, probably, of Pungo Andongo, in about lat. $9^{\circ} 30'$ S., long. $15^{\circ} 34'$ E. Nearly fourteen degrees further E., and in the same parallel, stands Lucenda, the Cazembe's capital. Between these two points we have to arrange a route of 150 days' march, made by experienced travellers, who halted often and long for rest, and whose daily route may be taken at ten miles.

“In order to avoid Casange on the left, they went along the right bank of the Quanza, which rises in Bíhè, at a distance of fifteen days S.E., perhaps, from Pungo Andongo. They thus came to the estates of Bomba, between the rivers Quanza and Quango, which are said to be but seven days asunder. The titles of this chief are thus enumerated by Francesco Honorato: ‘Seculo Bomba, Cambambi, Camasaca, and Mugumbo Acalunga, Ruler and Lord of all the Songo and passage to the interior.’ The Pombeiros . . . appear to have entered the territory of Bomba, when they crossed the river Jumbo on the twelfth day of their march. On the 22nd, they arrived at the town of the Secúlo, or, as the Portuguese would say, the Duke Bomba. At a distance of four days from this they came to Pepumdi (?) Songo, also on a river Jumbo, and in three days more (twenty-nine in all) crossed the Quango.

“Five days beyond the Quango, the travellers crossed a desert nine or ten days in extent, to the town of Cabungi, on the frontier of the Muáta ya Nvo. The desert here mentioned, in which four rivers were met with, the road going along one of them (the Quihubue) for three days, extends probably over the dividing ridge between the valley of the Quango and that of the great rivers whereon lie the dominions of the Muáta ya Nvo. Nine days from Cabungi, they passed through a village forming part of the estates of Luconquésa, the queen-mother, and two days afterwards crossed the great river Casais (more probably Casézi) in a canoe. Again, in ten days, traversing another dividing ridge, marked by a two days' desert, they crossed the Lulúa also, the chief river of this region . . . in a canoe. In twelve days more, they arrived at the residence of the Muáta ya Nvo, or Muropúe.”—pp. 10—13.

As our readers may have almost lost themselves in this laby-

rinth of outlandish nomenclature, we pause for an instant to remind them that from Pungo Andongo to the abode of that man of many names, "Duke Bomba," the travellers had proceeded up the valley of the Quango, in a south-easterly direction, that, soon after leaving this spot, they turned to the north-west, until they had reached the summit of that mountain ridge, which divides the waters that feed the Quango from those that fall into the Lulúa. Hence they proceeded due north, till they arrived at the capital of the Muropúe :—

"Leaving the town of this chief, at the end of May, 1806, on their way to the Cazembe, they tell us that they had the sun (rising) *fall on the left side*, which implies a course about two points east of south; and in this course they persisted for about thirty-seven days. The frequent mention of rain, in this part of the journal, (from May to September,) shows that the wet season had set in. The rivers were numerous, and many of them waist deep. The chief were the Izabúgi, the Calalímo, Roando, Rova, Cazelle, the Caginrígi, crossed in a canoe; the Reu, Ropoege, and Lubúri, eighty yards wide, forded on the thirty-fourth day, and where the Muropúe's dominion terminates. These rivers, together with other and large streams further on, to a distance of twelve days, all flow into the Lulúa."—p. 14.

It is clear, from a consideration of facts, and from the features of the country, which have already been sufficiently ascertained, that the Lulúa is the main stream, and its valley the cradle, of the Zaire or Congo. The origin of that river is, therefore, to be found to the south, instead of the north, of the equator: the greater part of its course runs in a north-westerly, instead of a south-westerly direction; nor is it until it has performed more than five-sixths of its allotted journey, that it adopts that which has been supposed to characterize it throughout.

Cognate, with the term LULÚA, is the Gentile appellation ALÚA, by which Mr. Cooley designates the subjects of the Muropúe. The connexion between the people and their river is found in all parts of the world, in all times, and in all languages, for it is founded on nature. Thus we have the Iberians and the Iberus, the Ligurians and the Liger, Roma and the Rumon: we have *Esk-dale* men, and *Tyne-mouth* men; and, on the continent, with which we are at present occupied, the land and the people of Misraim, called after the Ægyptus, or Nile.

The Muropúe appears to be a sovereign of considerable importance. On both sides of the valley of the Lulúa his empire extends to a distance of thirty-four days' journey, though it is clear that on the western bank this measure must be taken as representing less than on the eastern :—

“The visit of the Pombeiros, bearing fine presents, among which were a scarlet coat, with gilt buttons, made a favourable impression on the Muátay a Nvo², who dispatched, in consequence, an embassy to Mueneputo (king of Portugal). His ambassadors not being allowed to cross the territory of Casange, took the circuitous route by Bomba, and reached Loanda in the beginning of 1808. They bore presents consisting of slaves, skins of apes and zebras, mats, rush-baskets, two bars of copper, and one sample of salt. They were fine-looking men, with long beards, their arms and legs loaded with copper rings, and heads adorned with parrot's feathers. The Pombeiros, who conducted them to Loanda, described, in advantageous terms, the power and civilization of the Alúa, and the size and opulence of their capital. They also stated that the queen resided at a distance of thirty or forty leagues from the king, with a separate jurisdiction; one member of the embassy, indeed, was appointed by her majesty. This story, which has little likelihood,” observes Mr. Cooley, “originated probably in the separate estate of the queen-mother, Luconquesa; and again,” suggests he, “the respect paid to a female of the royal family, seems to indicate that among the Alúa the inheritance of the crown passes, not in lineal succession, but to the sister's son.”—p. 17.

The Muropúe's, however, is not the only powerful sovereignty which exists in the interior of Africa; between the fifth and fifteenth degree of southern latitude, that of the Cazembe is of at least equal importance, whilst on the north-eastern shores of the mysterious sea-lake of Nyassa, the ancient empire of the Moene-moézi, awakens the interest and curiosity of the student:—

“On crossing the Lubúri,” proceeds Mr. Cooley, “the Pombeiros entered the territory of Muinga Mucenda, lord of the frontier, whose office it is to supply the wants of travellers on this most difficult part of their road between the Muropúe and the Cazembe. Four days further on, the general direction of the march changed, and the rising sun, which had been hitherto on the left side, was henceforward (from the 11th September) constantly in front; the course had, therefore, turned to the east. The country now became undulating, the bare ridges taking a greenish hue from the copper ores, while numerous fine streams, the Lufúla, amongst the chief, hurried down to the Lualába³. Half a day was spent in wading across the marsh or lagoon of Quibonda. A visit was paid to Muíre, the lord of the copper mines, who, with another chief, named Cambembe, manufactures all the copper bars exported from this district to both sides of the continent. In former days these chiefs were independent; now they are vassals of the Cazembe, and pay their tribute of copper bars to their neighbour and superior in rank, Quibúri, the Cazembe's immediate representative.

² i. e. the same as the Muropúe or sovereign of the Alúa.

³ The Lualába is a distinguished tributary of the Lulúa running in a south-westerly course—from, therefore, the north-east.

Having forded the Luigíla, which forms at its junction with the Lualába, the famous salt-marsh of Quigíla, our travellers crossed on the forty-third day the Lualába itself, 100 yards wide, in a canoe, and entered the hospitable hamlet of Quibúri, the lord of the salt-marsh."—p. 18.

His dominion extends over a distance of sixteen days' journey.

It would appear that in other times this territory owned the suzerainty of the Muropúe: now, however, its chief acknowledges the supremacy of the Cazembe—a connexion which has been cemented by a matrimonial alliance.

"This appears to be a bare, elevated tract, partially covered with extensive marshes. The people of this country, we are told, do not cultivate the ground, because it was never the custom to do so, but buy cassava, millet, and other food, and grass cloth for apparel, with salt and copper, the only products of the land. A custom such as this," observes Mr. Cooley, "evidently implies an ancient and uninterrupted trade; for stoppage in such a case would be extinction. The elevated country abounds with game; the rivers and lakes with fish. The native traders, met with by the Pombeiros on their journey, were laden with nothing but manioca, venison, fish, salt, copper bars, and green stones or copper ores, probably for ornaments. The salt of Quigíla is said to be obtained by the evaporation of a lye made by washing the ashes of the plants that grow in the marsh . . . ; yet rock-salt also (*sal de Pedras*) is said to be carried from Quigíla."—p. 19.

This district, the country of the salt and copper mines, which constitute the main-spring of the internal trade of Southern Africa, is well known to the surrounding nations under the various names of Louvar, Lovale, Lobale, and Zavale. It is clearly the fountain-head, or origin of three systems of watershed—one falling eastward to the Atlantic by the channels of the Zaire, Quanza, &c., another eastward into the lake Nyassa and the valley of the Luapúla, and a third southward to the plains of the Seshéke. Leaving, however, for the while these abstractions, let us proceed with our energetic friends the Pombeiros:—

"Three days from the Lualába they forded the Bacasacála, which runs into the former, and consequently belongs to the basin of the Lulúa. . . . Passing for four days over the mountain of Conda Irungo, the road descended for four days along the river Lutipúca, which forms at its junction with the Luapúla, a marsh of great extent, and periodically dry; when seen by our travellers it was covered with wild animals of many kinds. On the twenty-fifth day from the Lualába the Pombeiros crossed the Luapúla, 112 yards wide, and lodged with Tambo Aquilala, the lord of the port or ferry. . . . They now turned a point or two north-eastwards, and had in December the sun on the right hand. Continuing their route down the right bank of the Luapúla, they came

in a day to the village of Pemba, Cazembe's sister, where they were hospitably regaled with fish and pombe or beer. Messengers dispatched to the capital to announce the arrival of the strangers, returned in a few days with the prince's welcome, and a present consisting of a goat, some cassava, fresh fish, and a slave girl. They then resumed their march, and in three days reached Lucenda, the town of the Cazembe.

"This town stands at a short distance from the Luapúla, on the northern bank of a broad marsh, or lagoon, called the Mouva, which receives the waters of several small streams, the Canegóa, Lunda, &c., and is connected with the Luapúla a little further down to the N.E. Being nearly surrounded by rivers and marshes it enjoys security from sudden attack, but is extremely unhealthy, on which account its site has been changed more than once, but never so as to remove it effectually beyond the reach of the pestilent influence."—p. 25.

We now reach a point which has been visited by Europeans, and that too from the eastern coast of Africa; thus joining, as it were, the two cords of discovery by a well-compacted knot; and the route from Lucenda to the shores of the Eastern Ocean is verified by a comparison of the journal of the Pombeiros already referred to, with that of Dr. Lucerda, and by various other independent testimonies.

Let us commence as our author does at the extreme east:—

"On the 3rd July, 1798, Lucerda started with a very large retinue from the northern bank of the Zambéze, opposite to Tête, and passing for two days through the estates of the Portuguese crown, entered the country of the Marávis, or independent native chiefs. The fifth day brought him to Mashinga in lat. $15^{\circ} 19' 15''$ S. On the seventh he arrived at Lupáta, or the defile, where the district of Bive terminates. On the tenth, which brought him to Java, he twice crossed the Aruangoa, which he remarks is a great river; but he says nothing of its course or destination. On the 7th August, the fourteenth day, he halted near the town of Mocanda, a chief of the Mutumbúca, having crossed the rivers Rúi and Búe running eastwards to the Shíre. On the banks of the Uzeréze, another affluent of the Shíre, he met with natives whose traffic extended to Mozambique. Here," observes Mr. Cooley, "it deserves to be specially noted, that Lucerda had so far marched but fourteen days out of thirty-six, yet his followers it seems were horrified at the thought of marching ordinarily $2\frac{1}{2}$ (Portuguese) leagues, or about $9\frac{1}{2}$ statute miles a day. This," he justly adds, "is a weighty comment on the long marches frequently introduced into African itineraries. The country gone over was generally dry, and the water in the village wells as white as milk. The soil seemed poor, though it supplied the natives with a sufficiency of millet, yams, and batatas.

"The direction of the route, which had been hitherto N.N.W., now turned more westward. The town of Mocanda's son, Caperaméra, reached on the nineteenth day, was large and populous, and thronged

with Movíza, driven southwards by famine. The twenty-first march was over hills, the highest yet met with, ranging generally W.N.W. and E.S.E. These hills separate Caperamera (the Mutumbúca) from Masse (Muáza). The rugged tract being crossed, the march went over the territory of Mazavamba, and on the twenty-sixth day (the fifty-fourth, halts included) ended at the river Aruángo. This river was now, in the dry season, about $3\frac{1}{2}$ feet deep, and 35 yards wide, though, owing to the mouldering banks, its width seemed very variable. On its northern bank, close to the water, grew large trees, the first seen on the journey. Many traces were found of Movíza hunters, who kill the hippopotamus for food. Lucerda had intended to send a party down this river in a canoe, but found on examination that it is not navigable in the dry season. He also remarks that this was the third river which he knew of named Aruángo; one being to the S. of the Zambéze, another a few days N. of it.

“Beyond the Aruángo, the tracks of elephants grew frequent. On the thirtieth day (the fourth from the river) the route led over the Serra Muchingue, which is said to extend from the Shíre to Zumbo (on the Zambéze), or, in other words, to follow the left bank of the Aruángo. This part of the journey was extremely harassing; trees and bogs hindered the march, the country was dreary, the nights very cold, the day burning hot. When we are told that there was no change in the face of the country from Tête, we must understand that rugged bush and low thicket continued to be its chief features; that there was no large timber, no smiling luxuriant landscape. On the thirty-first day, a spacious valley was entered, filled with villages of Movíza, clad in cloth of bark, and with frizzled heads well powdered with a bright red dust, derived from wood. The millet harvest being just ended, the people were all intoxicated with the newly-made pombe or beer; but the villages generally bore marks of poverty and wretchedness, the country having suffered from famine. Here Lucerda repeats the remark which he had previously made, that there is no salt in these countries. The Movíza procure their salt either from Tête, or from the Cazembe. After passing over a succession of ridges, alternating with narrow swampy plains, our traveller reached on the thirty-ninth day (the thirteenth from the Aruángo) the (New) Zambéze. ‘Here,’ he says, ‘end the famished territories of those frizzled and periwigged people (the Movíza).’ The Zambéze, flowing to the left, was fifty yards broad and four or five feet deep. The Mosocúma in the camp, when asked where this river goes to, replied, that it joins the river (the Luapúla), which runs close by the Zimboe (Zimbáwe, royal residence) of the Cazembe. The Musocúma dwell on the shores of the Nhanja or Lake.

“A little beyond the New Zambéze, a narrow but deep affluent of that river was forded, the name of which we find written, Rucurue (Ruçurue or Risúro). And now the look of the country was totally changed. The hills which had confined the view from Tête to the New Zambéze were at an end, and a nearly level plain extended to the horizon. The first night beyond the river was spent in the large town

of Chimimba Campéze, where some Movízas were met with, who were engaged in conveying the Cazembe's ivory to the east coast. After wading through a dry marsh, the expedition arrived, on the forty-second day, at the town of the Fumo Chipáco, a subject of the Cazembe. This was the largest and most populous town seen as yet. The chief courteously assured the strangers that all that he possessed was at their disposal. After a day's rest, the march was continued, through an undulating tract, succeeded by a low plain, overspread with stagnant waters. On the forty-seventh day, the expedition, crossing the river Ruanzéze, arrived at the town of Mouro Achinto, where the district of Chipáco terminates. Here Lacerda learned that towards the N., and between the Musocúma, who are on the banks of the Shíre, or Nhanja, and the Movíza, are the Auémba, who, as well as the Mosocúma, are enemies of the Cazembe. The Arambes, or Ambos, to the S., are his friends. The country was now covered with large trees, which reminded Lucerda of the forests of Brazil. Elephants appeared numerous. From Mouro Achinto the Portuguese were obliged to make a forced march of seven days to Lucenda, over a country for the most part desolate. They soon came to a small hamlet, where they tasted some delicious *sura*, or palm wine, and learned that its inhabitants were bound to deliver, at the Cazembe's dwelling, every third day, fresh *sura*, made of the wild palm called Uchinda. A tract of undulating ground, rugged and stony, but not very elevated, interrupted, for nearly a day, the wide swampy plain. On the fiftieth day, a native remarked, that on the left was the Great Lagoon which he and Manoel Caetano (the creole trader who first drew attention to this country) had crossed in their last journey. Further on, the villages were found to be deserted on account of the lions. At length, on the 2nd October, the fifty-fourth day of the march (the ninety-second from starting), the expedition arrived at Lucenda, but its entry into the town was forbidden until the Cazembe should have gone through certain propitiatory ceremonies." — pp. 26—30.

This expedition, thus laid before the world, opens to our view a highly interesting country, points out an important mercantile route, and adds another portion to the previously existing stock of authentic geography. It is unfortunate for the cause of science that Lucerda, worn out with fatigue and fever, died at Lucenda on the eighteenth of October, only seventeen days after the arrival of the expedition at that interesting spot. His infinite superiority to his followers, both in science and intelligence, makes his loss an irreparable one. Still, however, many interesting particulars may be derived from their statements. One of the most characteristic circumstances occurred almost immediately upon Lucerda's death. The Cazembe became impatient for the production of his present, and, finding that it did not appear as soon as he expected, he sent to draw two of the teeth of Father Francisco João Pinto, upon whom the command of

the expedition had now devolved. The message, however, was not formally delivered, and the hint acted satisfactorily upon the worthy, though somewhat dilatory ecclesiastic. The prince's subsequent treatment of the strangers was uniformly kind and considerate, notwithstanding their frequent misconduct. He treated them, indeed, with munificent hospitality, and when a dangerous illness had alarmed him for his own safety, recommended them especially to the forbearance and good feeling of his people. Their request, however, to be permitted to proceed westwards to Angola he parried by every means short of absolute refusal.

"The Cazembe," we are told, "exhibited to the Muzungos, or white men (properly wise men), soon after their arrival, and evidently with a view to obtain information, the various contents of his private treasury. These were stuffs of several kinds, silk, velvet, woollen, and cotton, including some 'printed calicoes of the north,'—probably Manchester goods,—glass, porcelain, and packages of tea. Most of these articles had reached him from the eastern coast: the Banyans, as Lander frequently informs us, being, in reality, the merchants of these countries. He had also a few muskets. The exports of the Cazembe are slaves, ivory, skins of wild animals (leopard, Macaco ape, zebra, &c.), copper bars, green stones, and salt."—p. 36.

The Cazembe exhibited the most singular example with which we are acquainted of aristocratic sympathy. He possessed a herd of cattle which were running wild, and turned to no account. He would not eat their flesh, because he conceived that horned cattle were *fumos*, or nobility, like himself! And yet this refined and sentimental exclusive sold his fellow-men as slaves! A strange, a melancholy, a ludicrous depravation this of the human heart! and yet it is far from impossible that were some enlightened subject of this prince to visit Europe, he might carry back to his own wild land the record of habits of thought, and modes of feeling, ay, and of action too, which are quite as inconsistent with the natural laws and the inherent instincts of our being, to say nothing of that book which teaches us that God made all men of one blood.

Alas for the reason and the conscience of man! Whensoever and wheresoever the principle of *self* exerts its absolute supremacy, whether in the concentrated form of mere egotism, or in the more expansive phase of class interest, God above, and man around, melt from the mental vision, filled, wheresoever the diseased eye turns its gaze, with countless reflections and reproductions of the endless, infinite, eternal I.

But we must not moralize in the centre of Africa, or we shall

never get back again, although the interior of that continent has been thus ably laid open by Mr. Desborough Cooley.

“The Cazembe’s people, the Arunda, or Alunda (in the singular, M’runda); are described as tall, vigorous, and quite black. They do not file their teeth, nor tattoo, nor mark themselves with scars. Their ordinary dress is a wrapper from the waist to the knee, fastened with a leathern belt. Their feet are covered with strung shells and polished stones, and their heads adorned with handsome feathers. On great occasions, they wear a kind of very full shirt, with a tricoloured border and gathered in front, which is said to make a fine appearance.”—p. 37.

The sovereignty of the Cazembe is not of very ancient date; it was little more than a century ago that his ancestor, Ganga Abilonda, son of an officer of the Muropúe, being appointed lord of Quigíla, or the Salt Marsh, carried his arms eastward, and occupied Quichinga. Though the CAZEMBE is now independent, that title assumed by the conqueror appears to signify viceroy; and the monarch of Lucenda still affects to recognise, in some sort, the superiority or pre-eminence of the Muropúe, since, with marked respect of language, he styles him father.

We have dwelt so long on the route which we have been discussing, and on the territories of the Alúa and Alunda, that we have no space, within the limits allotted to this paper, for the other interesting subjects treated in the memoir under consideration. We have deemed it advisable rather to exhibit the main line in its entirety, than those fragments which, however interesting and valuable when considered in connexion with it, are, when taken alone, but *disjecta membra*. Nor could we otherwise have given any fair notion of what this volume effects. We must leave the reader to discover for himself, in the remaining pages of this well-digested volume, the notices which he will there find of the regions which border on the eastern shore of the mysterious sea lake, or river lake, Nyassa; of the routes which join the country of the Moenemoézi with the coast of the Indian Ocean; and of the results of missionary enterprise in a north-easterly direction.

With regard to these portions of his work, we are of opinion that he has very successfully demolished the snow mountain, Kilíma Njáro, though he is possibly rather too severe in his administration of the critical discipline to the travellers in question. Otherwise we have no fault to find with him, saving that we cannot feel at all sure that when “Khamis ben Othman declared that the River Liwáha, or, as he called it, the Lufigi, issues from the lake, and that he saw its outlet with his own

eyes," he was under a delusion, especially as Mr. Cooley allows "his testimony" to have been "earnest and sincere."

It will give us sincere pleasure to recur to the subject when further accounts of this very important lake, and of the very interesting people who dwell on its shores, are laid before us. We will only add at present that its *ascertained* length is from latitude 7° S. to latitude 12° S.; that it lies from north-west to south-east in long. $30^{\circ} 35'$ W.; that it is covered with islands; that the width of the lake is said to be three days' journey in a canoe, and its length two months' voyage in a canoe, or one month's in an English ship.

We cannot, however, pass over without any mention the expedition of Oswell and Livingstone to the shores of the Lake Ngami, in lat. $20^{\circ} 20'$ S., long. $23^{\circ} 20'$ E. From this lake, a river, the Zouga, 200 yards wide, flows east and south-east irregularly, about 300 miles, till it is lost in the ocean:—

"After crossing an almost waterless desert of deep sand, the travellers beheld with delight the fine river, and the lake extending out of sight to the north and west, its banks shaded with trees of great size. But they were still more pleased with the intelligence that, on the north and west, rivers flowed into the lake, communicating with other and greater rivers, and that there lay towards the north-east a great extent of navigable waters. [This was in 1849.] To the examination of these they returned the following year, and . . . drove their wagons to the banks of the Chóbe, a fine navigable river, in lat. $18^{\circ} 23'$ S., long. 26° E., and thus penetrated to a distance of at least 2000 miles from Cape Town. . . . Leaving their wagons at the Chóbe, they proceeded on horseback about 100 miles further N.E., to the banks of the Seshéke (sand banks), in lat. $17^{\circ} 28'$ S., and found it to be from 300 to 500 yards wide, with a great volume of water and considerable swell. The natives all agreed in stating that it comes from Lobale, about 400 miles distant northward or N.N.W. About four days' journey below the point reached by the travellers, it forces its way in a contracted channel through some rocky hills, and is at length precipitated with such noise and vapour as to procure for the spot the name of Mosi wa thunya, or Smoke Sounds (roaring vapours). Lower down it is joined by another river of less magnitude, the Maninchi or Bashukolompo, and the united waters then take the name of Zabeza or Zambéze. The Chóbe also flows into the Seshéke from the west, and these rivers are furthermore reported to be connected with each other, and with Lake Ngami, and its rivers by transverse canals, which make of them, in the floods at least, a single system of waters. The Seshéke, or river of Barotse, . . . the centre of the system, and the largest of all the streams connected with it, appears to inundate the adjacent country to a distance of 15 miles from its banks. In fact, the country round the lower course of these rivers, must present in

copious floods the appearance of a sea, the limits of which are not easily assigned. The whole region overspread, and interlaced with swamps, rivers, and transverse canals, as represented in the map founded on native information, has an extent, from east to west, of 400 or 500 miles. In the latitude of Lake Ngami also, but from three to six degrees further east, are immense salt-pans, that of Twetwe being supposed to have a length of 100 miles, which are, of course, occasionally lakes. But the filling of the salt lakes, and the general inundation of the country seem to take place only occasionally, and not periodically. The climate is dry; little rain falls, and the floods, which give fertility to the soil, come from a great distance. . . . Such appears to have been the case both in 1849 and 1850, so that it still remains doubtful whether the inundation of the country and its conversion into a great lake, interspersed with islands, be a frequent or a rare phenomenon."—pp. 129—131.

And here we must take leave of our author, without entering into the very interesting questions of the subsequent course and fate of the Seshéke.

In sum, the principal information collected in this memoir may be thus condensed. In the centre of Southern Africa is the high land of Lobale or Lovar, the mine district; from the three slopes of this elevated country the waters fall respectively to the Atlantic, the Lake Nyassa, and the system of the Seshéke. The valley of the Lulúa, which represents the first of these inclinations, is ruled by the Muropúe or Muáta ya Nvo. Lobale itself, as well as the north-western slope of the high lands, though originally owning his dominion, is now ruled by the Cazembe, whose capital, Lucenda, is on the Lualába, or main stream of the north-west; further eastward, and separated from his subjects, the Arunda, by hostile tribes, lies the great lake Nyassa, upon the northern shores of which exists the powerful empire or confederation (as the case may be) of the Moenemoézi. The southern slope is occupied by the Abutua, and its water system is represented by the great, but imperfectly known river of Seshéke, and intimately connected with the lake of Batlele or Ngami.

Thus much we already know. Let us hope that we shall soon know more; and in the meantime render our sincere thanks to Mr. Cooley for having thus far successfully laid Inner Africa open.

ART. VI.—*A Memoir of the Rev. W. A. B. Johnson, Missionary of the Church Missionary Society, in Regent's Town, Sierra Leone, A.D. 1816—1823. With some Prefatory Remarks. By the Rev. W. JOWETT, M.A., Incumbent of St. John's Church, Clapham, &c. London: Seeleys.*

FIFTY years ago the Missions of the Church of England were confined within comparatively narrow limits; and, assuredly, looking at the efforts which had been made so far, it must be admitted that there was deep cause for humiliation on the part of all members of the Church. How that apathy and indifference which appeared to brood over us were to be most effectually removed, was without doubt a question which was conscientiously considered by the pious men, who at the commencement of the present century established the "Church Missionary Society," for the conversion of the Heathen in Africa and the East. It was a question on which differences of opinion were likely to arise; and on which conscientious men, accordingly, were found to entertain views by no means in harmony. The ancient Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, had to the full extent of their means faithfully and effectually promoted the spread of Christianity in the British Colonies. But these means were comparatively limited, and the efforts of the former Society had been directed chiefly to the maintenance of Christianity amongst the descendants of English in the Colonies; while the latter had fostered the Missions in Southern India, founded by the apostolical Ziegenbalg and Swartz. But since the commencement of the present century, the work of Missions has advanced steadily, and with results so cheering and consolatory, that it might be said once more to the Church, "Rejoice, thou barren, that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband." In the East the Church Missionary Society has rescued New Zealand from heathenism; its missionaries have been gathering in a plentiful harvest in Hindostan, and toiling to plant the Cross in China. In Africa its triumphs in the conversion of the negroes have been great. In America, amongst the frozen wilds of Rupert's Land, it is pursuing its hallowed work. And as it has proceeded in that work, the means of supplying its needs have continually augmented:

it has been fertilizing the parent land with the evidence and reflex of that faith which its holy missionaries have been made instrumental in eliciting and cherishing. This Society, in its origin, represented chiefly one section of the Church; but it has been gradually winning the confidence, to a great extent, of Churchmen generally; and while its constitution appears to render collision with ecclesiastical authority possible, it has been found practically, for the most part, to be under the influence of such Christian feeling and discretion, and of a spirit of such sincere attachment to the Church of England, that its missionaries are recognized by the Colonial Episcopate as amongst their most valued and most faithful coadjutors.

We must now allude to the magnificent results of the labours of the elder societies of the Church. To the Propagation of the Gospel Society the Church is indebted for the faithful and persevering support of those Missions in the Colonies of North America, where, through the instrumentality of its missionaries, the foundation of a true and vital religion was substantially laid; and where its vigour and life were severely tested by the prevailing spirit of secularity, the indifference of the parent country, the absence of an episcopate long and vainly sought for, the presence of an unworthy and careless ministry. That seed of life cast in by the missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, survived the storms of the Revolution; and has grown on and expanded, till a Church, sister to our own, is seen in the United States, with its thirty bishops, its two thousand clergy, and its two millions of adherents. Nor is this the only triumph which has evidenced the Divine blessing on the labours of this great Society. Its missionaries have gained in Southern India conquests which are unsurpassed in magnitude and rapidity; nor is there a point in the English Colonies, or their vicinity, where the missionaries of this Society, now augmenting continually in numbers, as the funds of the Society increase, are not to be found labouring in their sacred vocation. And still the cry is for more labourers, and it seems that scarcely a limit can be placed to the successes of this Society, unless the means of promoting its work should be withheld.

We have spoken on more than one occasion of the recently founded Society for Church Missions in Ireland for the Conversion of Roman Catholics, and of the Irish Society for the same object. The fame of these Missions has now spread throughout the world, and the propagandism of Rome has at length found more than its match, and is fast yielding before the powerful agency of Truth.

It is our purpose in the following pages to notice two works, as

illustrative of the spirit, and also the action, of two of the Church societies to which we have above adverted—the Church Missionary Society, and the Propagation of the Gospel Society. We had recently occasion to direct attention to the truly apostolical labours of a missionary of the latter Society, the Rev. W. H. BRETT, in British Guinea. It will now be our pleasing duty to place before the reader an outline of the labours of a missionary of the Church Missionary Society. In these instances, as well as in the case of the Irish Church missionaries to which we have adverted before, obstacles and perils of the most formidable and discouraging nature, have given way before a spirit of steadfast faith and perseverance, and a system of instruction carefully and nicely adapted to the circumstances of the case. We may add, too, that in the case of the Irish Church Missions, and the Missions in Guiana, the work which has been carried on appears to have been thoroughly satisfactory in its results: no enthusiasm or false excitement appears to have been created; but the fruits of the Spirit have been evidenced in renewed hearts and improved habits of life. We have now to direct the reader's attention to one of the most remarkable and impressive narratives of missionary labour that has ever appeared. The Rev. W. A. B. Johnson, the subject of the "Memoir" before us, was connected with the Church Missionary Society, in the first instance, as a schoolmaster, afterwards as a missionary, at Sierra Leone. At this station, surrounded by sickness and death, and in continual expectation of being visited and carried off by the plague which desolates that fatal land, this missionary laboured, in a spirit of perfect self-abnegation, and with an intensity of zeal and charity which has rarely indeed been rivalled or even approached; and whose fervour has, amidst its occasional errors, a grandeur which places its subject amongst the most remarkable men that have ever laboured to advance the kingdom of God.

It was the remark of a minister, referred to in the work before us, that "we do the best we can to raise up a succession of faithful ministers of the Gospel, and to a certain degree we succeed; though we often have to mourn over grievous disappointments. But now and then it pleases God to take the work into His own hands. He raises up a man, and makes him a preacher of the Gospel by His own especial teaching; and *then* we behold a very different sort of minister from any that human efforts or human skill can produce." The missionary Johnson would seem to have been an instance of this kind. What might not have been the effect had this man been permitted to survive to the ordinary term of human life, in the full exercise of his ministry? Without doubt, the entire conversion of that region was reserved for another

time and another agency; or else, to all appearance, this missionary would ere long have emerged from the comparatively narrow limits of Sierra Leone, and become the apostle of Western Africa.

The history of his call and ministry is most striking. He first appears as a poor German mechanic in London. His education has been very limited; and he has been engaged in the drudgery of manual labour, and the cares and poverty incidental to it. His distress drives him to prayer, and a remarkable instance of Providence awakens him further. He is fully awakened and converted through the instrumentality of some Moravian brethren. He is instantly at work, seeking to convert others. His strong impulses find an appropriate direction through the addresses of missionaries at a public meeting. He resists those impulses, however, for two years, from a belief that no missionary society would send forth a married man to its work. At length he meets a missionary who has been appointed to Western Africa, and by him he is brought to the Church Missionary Society.

Such were the evident zeal and devotion of this mechanic, that the Committee of the Society, after a single interview, appointed him as schoolmaster in connexion with the missions at Sierra Leone. He was trained for a year for this purpose, and then passed to the sphere of his labours. He was placed amongst a large population of ignorant savages just released from slavery, and commenced his schools with great and rapid success. But from the outset the schoolmaster was a missionary. His burning zeal—his love of souls—rendered it impossible for him to refrain from proclaiming, at all times, and in all ways, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The effects were immediate: numbers of heathens pressed forward to receive the waters of baptism. Children, men—persons of all ages were equally impressed. Persons came to speak to him of the state of their souls, and in many instances the workings of Divine grace were manifest.

So great a work was proceeding in the course of a few months, that the managers of the Missionary Society perceived the necessity of placing the schoolmaster in the position to which he was evidently called. He was accordingly ordained according to the Lutheran form by several of their missionaries in those parts—an irregularity which was not altogether without sanction from the practice of the elder society of the Church of England, and into the discussion of which we need not now enter. He then commenced as missionary at Freetown, where the effects of his teaching on the whole population appear to have been marvellous. Religion became the absorbing and devouring interest of the negroes. Young and old—persons of all ages and sexes were

attracted. The church was filled, and enlarged again and again, till it attained the largest dimensions. Numbers were continually baptized after they had afforded full evidence of faith and conversion. The communicants multiplied by hundreds. The sums contributed by the negroes towards the promotion of missions were astonishing. A general fervour of devotion was witnessed; the very fields were dotted with kneeling figures of men, women, and children praying with the deepest fervency, while tears were flowing down their cheeks. As night closed in, the men in one direction, and the women in another, united in singing the praises of God. The church resounded at all hours with young voices singing hymns, or engaged in prayer. The missionary was beset with anxious inquirers after the way of salvation. Every day, at morning and evening, the service was attended by these new-born Christians in multitudes; and they never seemed to weary of religious exercises. Negro teachers and missionaries began to appear and to be formed for their work: they preached to their brethren; they prayed with them; they went amongst the heathen of the surrounding country; they addressed epistles full of love and Christian faith to their beloved pastor during his absence. The religious fervour of these children of Africa had a tendency at first to excess and enthusiasm. The preacher was often interrupted by the sobs and cries of the people; persons were carried away fainting from excess of emotion; and it was with difficulty that their feelings were restrained within the limits of sobriety and decorum in public worship. In the mean time the country was improved: roads were made, and houses, gardens, and cultivated fields, and an orderly and well-clad and civilized population occupied a place which but a few years before had been a desert. In the course of a few years crime diminished so much that, while the population had quadrupled, the committals had fallen to one-seventh of their former amount.

This great work was the result of two or three years' labour, when it was interrupted by the illness of his wife, which obliged him to return for a time to England. During his absence of nine months, his mission was mismanaged by the person appointed to its charge, and a great falling off was the result. But on his return, in 1820, the lost ground was speedily retrieved, and a rapid advance took place, which was suddenly terminated by his death, of fever in 1823, at thirty-five years of age.

We must cite a few passages in illustration of the preceding details.

Shortly after his arrival at Regent's Town, he writes in 1816:—

“*Sunday, July 14.* Family prayer between five and six o'clock, A. M. —the house full. Opened worship by singing a hymn (of which the

natives are very fond); read and explained the latter part of the 46th chapter of Jeremiah; sung another hymn and concluded with prayer.

“*Ten o'clock.* Divine service. Opened worship by singing a hymn; read the Church Service; sung a hymn; prayed; explained the 18th chapter of the Gospel according to St. John. Spoke on the sufferings of Christ, the fall of man, and the necessity of his sufferings; concluded with singing a hymn and prayer. The whole house, piazza, and windows full: some were obliged to stand in the yard. Oh! may God the Holy Spirit own His Word, and bless the few imperfect remarks which have been made.

“*July 18th.* Last week and last Sunday, after Divine Service I made it known to the different black settlers (some live about one mile from here), who have the children under their care (some have two, three, four, and five boys), to send them on Monday, when the bell (which the governor has sent last week) should ring for school. Accordingly, ninety boys, besides girls made their appearance. . . . The adults' school which I have likewise opened on Monday evening, consists at present of thirty-five men and sixteen women.”

Shortly afterwards he writes thus:—

“Thus far I kept a regular journal, but now my labours became so great that I scarcely had an hour to myself from one Sunday to another. More captured negroes arrived from on board ship, and I had soon to provide for a thousand. A storehouse having been finished, I was obliged to send the people from this place to Freetown, which is five miles, under a guide, for rice every day. Had also to issue rice for this number of people every Wednesday and Saturday without any assistance. Sometimes I was on the point of giving up all; but the prospect of bringing them to a crucified Jesus, enabled me to endure. The schools also increased; and when I had gained a little order, and G. Lancaster was able to go on, he died. I was then again without assistance, and my day school increased to the number of 140 boys. At length, I received a boy from Sierra Leone, but who proved to be of no use whatever; he soon left me. I tried several more, who did more harm than good. Thus I was obliged to endure many discouragements, but still my encouragements were still more. Hearers and scholars increased daily. A stone church, which contains about 500 people, was then building, . . . about the fourth Sunday I had the great pleasure of seeing the church nearly full. The people in general became more industrious, and strove to get clothing in order to come clean on Sunday to church; in this they made a very rapid progress.

“Thus I went on speaking morning and night, and on Sundays three times, but saw no fruit of conversion, but, on the contrary, was sometimes much discouraged; for when I had done speaking, they would come and ask me for clothing, &c., which gave me reason to think they only came for that purpose.

“In October, 1816, one evening a shingle maker (Joe Thompson) followed me out of church, and desired to speak to me. I was in

some measure cast down, thinking that he wished to speak to me for clothing. However, with astonishment, I found that he was in deep distress about the state of his soul. He said, that one evening, he had heard me ask the congregation, if any one had spent five minutes in prayer that day to Jesus, or the past day, week, month, or year? He was so struck with it, and could not answer the question for himself. He had heard the present and future state of the wicked explained. He could answer nothing but that he was wicked; after that all the sins which he had ever done before, had entered into his mind. He had tried to pray, but he could not—he would therefore ask me what he should do to save his soul. What I felt at that moment is inexpressible. I pointed him to a crucified Jesus, and tears ran down his cheeks. I was obliged to leave him, for I could scarce contain myself. I went home and thanked God for having heard my prayers. The following week, several more came in like manner to me, which removed all doubts and fears at once, and I had such an assurance that God had sent me to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to the Gentiles, that there was no more room left for me to doubt. I went and related the circumstance to Mr. Butscher, at Leicester Mountain, and begged him to come and baptize them, which he did. Twenty-one adults, one boy, and three infants, captured negroes, were baptized. On Saturday evening I examined them one by one, and I was astonished to hear in what manifold and wondrous ways God had revealed Himself to these poor people. Several more came soon after, and the number amounted in January, 1817, to forty-one communicants."—pp. 36—38.

We now proceed to a description of the state of things at Easter, 1817, just after Mr. Johnson's ordination:—

"In the morning, whilst speaking to a crowded congregation on John ix. 25, several were affected and wept, and prayed aloud for mercy. In the afternoon, the same scene took place, whilst speaking on 1 Cor. xv. 55.

"In the evening, whilst engaged in prayer, crying and praying became general, so that I was obliged to leave off, and give out a hymn, but all to no purpose; I exhorted them to silence, and gave out the text, then gave out another hymn, but all no use. The greatest part of the congregation were on their knees, and crying aloud for mercy. What I felt, it is impossible to express with this pen. I was at length quite overcome, and obliged to leave my congregation in that state. While I passed toward the door, I saw one man on his knees, knocking with his hands on the boards, and crying 'Lord Jesus, me no let Thee go—pardon my sins first.' I went home, and heard nothing but cries, &c., for the space of fifteen minutes, in every direction. From that period I was obliged to use means to prevent further disturbances; for sometimes when I only mentioned the name of Jesus, cries were heard immediately. I gave directions to the door-keepers, that when more than one was thus affected, to take them out, and by these means we

have been enabled until now, to keep Divine Service in quiet, though we seldom have a Sunday without being obliged to use the above means. Blessed be the Lord for His mercy, that He makes Himself known through one so vile and wretched. . . . On Sundays, some are so eager to hear the Word, that they will come an hour before service to secure a seat, in order to hear the Word. The church is now to be made into the shape of a cross, which will give nearly as much room again."—pp. 53, 54.

The excessive manifestations of feeling noticed in the above passage, elicited from the Secretaries of the Church Missionary Society a very judicious and Christian admonition, representing the dangers attendant on excitement of the feelings, as giving full scope to the imagination, and leading to erroneous doctrine and sinful practice. This wise and well-timed advice had without doubt considerable and beneficial effect on the subsequent management of the mission. The letter itself is so excellent in many respects that it will be a gratification to our readers, we are assured, to peruse it:—

“ ‘ *The Secretaries to Mr. Johnson.*

“ ‘ *Church Missionary House, London,*

“ ‘ *June 26, 1819.*

“ ‘ *DEAR BROTHER JOHNSON,*

“ ‘ Your letter of the 24th of February reached us on the 2nd of June. The letter and journal by the ‘Pyrenees,’ and the journals of your excursion round the colony, and the minutes of your first anniversary of your Missionary Society forwarded in January, arrived safely, and have already been acknowledged and answered.

“ ‘ The Committee very sincerely sympathise with you in your present trials, and trust that you will experience the light and consolation of the Holy Ghost, by which your path may be made plain, and your mind supported.

“ ‘ Under the circumstances stated in your letter, the Committee do not object to your return with Mrs. Johnson, should this reach you before the point shall have been decided, and the reason for your doing so still continue to operate.

“ ‘ We appreciate the importance of your situation at Regent’s Town, but do not doubt that sufficient means now exist in the colony for supplying your temporary absence. There will be less difficulty in making arrangements for this purpose, as it appears by a letter recently received by Mr. Collier, that Mr. and Mrs. Jesty and Mr. Barratt had reached Sierra Leone on the 26th of March.

“ ‘ The Committee feel greatly encouraged by the success by which the Lord has been pleased to bless the exertions of the Society in Africa. We pray that every plan for making the Redeemer known to the inhabitants of that injured country may be laid and executed in that faith, prudence, humility, and zeal by which His glory may be

most effectually advanced, and His grace and salvation most effectually diffused.

“ ‘ Your report to the April meeting of Missionaries is truly gratifying, and we desire to give glory to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ for that blessing which has rendered your labour so eminently successful in bringing poor degraded Africans to a knowledge of Himself. We rejoice however with trembling, when we reflect upon *Satan's devices*, and the peculiar character of your people. Their knowledge of religion is, unavoidably, very limited, they have little experience in the Divine life, and their judgments consequently are very imperfectly formed, whilst their constitutions render them remarkably susceptible of having their feelings strongly wrought upon. A more perilous exposure to the ‘wiles of the Devil,’ can scarcely be conceived. A violent excitement to the feelings gives full scope to the power of the imagination, and it is by the imagination that Satan principally, if not exclusively, exerts his destructive agency upon the soul of man. Connect this view with the character of the enemy, and we may conclude certainly that traces of his influence will soon be visible among your people ; First, probably, by an infusion of erroneous doctrine, and then by its inseparable concomitant—sinful practices. Be, then, ‘sober, be vigilant’—‘try the spirits whether they be of God.’ Have your eye constantly upon the word of God. Take it in all its parts and extent. Labour to make your people thoroughly acquainted with it. Ever bear in mind that error in religion, whether it consists in opinion or practice, cannot be corrected by excluding from your ministry the truth which it perverts or distorts, but by a faithful, unequivocal, Scripture statement of it pressed home upon the heart and conscience, upon the authority of that God whose truth it is. Great prudence, incessant watchfulness, inflexible firmness, patience, forbearance, and a spirit of unwearied kindness, are requisite under your circumstances, that your people may be kept steady and upright in ‘that narrow way which leadeth unto life.’ We do not state these things from any doubt of your discretion or circumspection, but to warn you of dangers which seem to us great and imminent. The word of Christ which has already yielded support and comfort to your mind, is still applicable to your situation, and still adequate to your need : ‘*My grace is sufficient for thee.*’ To that grace we commend you, and implore the great Head of the Church, who has redeemed with ‘his own blood’ those precious souls whom we mutually are solicitous to guard and preserve, to vouchsafe you all these gifts and graces whereby your ministry may throughout be so conducted as may best promote His glory, and His people’s good :

“ ‘ We are, &c.

“ ‘ JOSIAH PRATT.

“ ‘ EDWARD BICKERSTETH.’

“ The wisdom and solid judgment which mark this letter will be appreciated by our readers ; and it seemed due to the Society to let this feature in the conduct of its affairs be fully known.”—pp. 189, 190.

We quote the following from the report of a missionary newly arrived in the Colony in 1819 :—

“ ‘ I have now given you a faithful and imperfect picture of the state of Regent’s Town. The Lord has certainly blessed, in a peculiar manner, the labours of Mr. Johnson. The people love him as their father; and reverence him as their spiritual guide. Should a dispute arise among any of them, they come to him to settle their palaver, and they abide by his decision. . . . The love which these people manifest among themselves, and toward their minister and all faithful missionaries; their anxiety and the fervency of their prayers that the Gospel may be made known through all nations—these things are worthy the admiration of all Christians. It may almost be said of the inhabitants of Regent’s Town, that they *dwelt in love*; and that they live a life of prayer and praise to Him, *who loved them and gave himself for them*: for, beside their meetings for prayer every morning and evening, the hearts of many of them seem to be full of the love of Christ the whole day; and when *they are merry, they sing Psalms*: such vocal music resounds from all parts of the town. A dispute is seldom known among them. They have every one of them cast off his gregree, and nearly all of them are become worshippers of the blessed Jesus. A few years since, none of the inhabitants of this place had ever heard the name of Jesus: they went about naked; and were, in every respect, like the savage tribes—but now, oh what a happy change! they are all decently dressed; and it is the most heart-cheering sight to see them flock together in crowds to the house of prayer.”—pp. 168, 169.

We quote the following passage from a letter of another missionary, who was in some degree alienated from Mr. Johnson, and who therefore was an unprejudiced witness.

“ ‘ We were much struck with the INTEGRITY of the people. In their anxiety to save as much as possible, almost every article was removed. In the confusion many things were scattered about the yard: not one article, however, even the most trifling, was lost; but all were brought again to the house, and fixed in their proper places. A boy, who had got possession of the box which contained the money for paying the mechanics and labourers, was found in the garden, parading with the box under his arm; and guarding it, though unnecessarily, with a drawn cutlass in his hand.

“ ‘ I was struck, during a fire which broke out in our house, with the sudden disappearance of the women, who, at the commencement, almost filled the house. On inquiry, I found that they had retired to the church, to offer up their prayers unto God. What but a Divine influence could draw them to God in this trial, to ask His blessing on the exertions of those employed?

“ ‘ While we were replacing the books which had been scattered on this occasion, two of the girls came to us. I asked what was wanted: ‘ Nothing, massa,’ was the reply; ‘ but we come tell you, God bear

every time somebody go talk Him.' 'How, my child,' said I, 'do you know that God hears His people when they pray?' She said 'Massa! when fire come this morning, I sabby your house no burn too much. Every morning I hear you and Mr. Cates, and you pray God keep this house, and all them girls and boys what live here; and when fire come, I say to Sarah, 'Ah! God plenty good: He heard what massa say to Him this morning: He no let this house burn too much.' What a reproof did I feel this! I knew how often my heart was indifferent while I asked for these mercies; and I trust it made me more anxious to urge the duty of family prayer on others more earnestly. Soon after, the same girls mentioned their desire for one of the elder girls to pray with the school-children, before they went to bed, and when they rose in the morning.

" 'Scarcely an event occurs but what they notice as springing from the over-ruling providence of God. Taught of God, they mark the painful events of His providence, as children would mark the dealings of a father. After the death of Mr. Cates, I have frequently heard their expressions of sorrow for sin, and acknowledgments of God's justice in punishing them. They have used such language as this:— 'We have done something very bad—God is very angry: He is removing all our teachers—by and bye nobody will be left to tell us good. We must pray, dear brothers and sisters: we must look into our own hearts—some bad live there.' Similar occurrences in England would have passed, perhaps, unheeded by the greater part of professing Christians.'—pp. 242, 243.

The following will show the attachment of this excellent missionary to the Liturgy of the Church.

" 'July 30, Sunday.—The prayer-meeting in the church, at six o'clock in the morning, was numerously attended. I gave an exhortation on the Lord's day, showing the imperfections and interruptions with which we have to struggle, while we meet in this world to worship God; and how great the difference will be, when we shall keep the eternal sabbath, when,—

" 'No more fatigue, no more distress,
Nor sin, nor death, shall reach that place;
No sighs shall mingle with the songs
That warble from immortal tongues.'

" 'Divine service at half-past ten. I read the prayers as usual, and David Noah responded with the whole congregation: I must confess, when I read some of those beautiful and spiritual prayers, I could have wept. There appeared a holy awe throughout the congregation. I saw one woman, while she repeated the prayers, especially that part— 'Lord, have mercy upon us! Christ have mercy upon us!'—weeping bitterly. After the prayers were read, I preached on Rev. iii. 19.— *As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten: be zealous, therefore, and repent.*'"—p. 250.

He alludes in several places to the errors of the Ranters and others who tried to disturb the churches. The following passage alludes to this subject, and to the want of more assistance.

“ ‘ Sending missionaries to Freetown will be the only means of putting a stop to the many heresies which have sprung up there. The longer that place is left as it is, the more will the people’s minds be prejudiced against the Church, and against the truth. Missionaries who will simply preach Christ crucified, will alone succeed.

“ ‘ But how hard it is to get missionaries!—yea, to get men who will really deny themselves, and take up their cross and come to Africa, not conferring with flesh and blood! We want men who have the mind of St. Paul, when the Holy Ghost witnessed in every city, saying that ‘ bonds and afflictions awaited him.’ Paul conferred not with flesh and blood, but said, ‘ None of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy.’ When he was besought with tears not to go, he declared that he was ‘ ready not only to be bound, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus.’

“ ‘ Oh, may God the Spirit separate more Pauls from the Church for the work of the ministry among the Gentiles, especially for Africa, which has the greatest claim on the Christian world. None have been more injured than Africa, and none is more degraded. I cannot help wondering, that so few come over to help us—all are for India or New Zealand, and Africa is scarcely left alive with a few fishermen. I think it is also time to assume the character of the widow in the Gospel, ‘ Avenge me of mine adversary!’ I plead not my own cause, but the widowhood of Africa—for her will I cry with importunity, ‘ Send Missionaries, send Missionaries! Avenge Africa of her adversary!’

“ ‘ As soon as Mr. Düring has left us, I shall visit all the settlements again. Mr. Reffell wishes to accompany me.

“ ‘ Yesterday we had the Lord’s Supper, and it was very gratifying for me to see *my children* come from every quarter to partake of that holy sacrament.’ ”—pp. 311, 312.

The negroes required a peculiar form of management.

“ *May 20.* Married two couples, after which a few disagreeable palavers were settled. Mr. Beckley arrived, and complained much that the apprentice-boys did not attend school in the evening. I am afraid there are faults on both sides; when the African gets a bad opinion of an European, there is no help. I know by experience that the missionary who has the affection of the people, can do more by two words spoken in season, yea, by a sorrowful look, than another with never so severe means. I have seen some who have used most entreating language to no purpose; why? Because the individuals entreated did not believe it came from the heart. Mr. Reffell asked me how I acted with such boys. I said, I reasoned with them, which had generally the right effect. Once, when a few carpenter’s boys refused to attend school, I ordered them to go to Kissy, and fetch each

one bushel of lime ; and when they came home, they begged my pardon with tears in their eyes.

"It was useless for me to entreat Mr. Beckley to use milder means, and act as a kind father. I am sorry he does not see things better. I believe he is zealous, but too impatient. Mr. Reffell was of my opinion, and wished I could speak to Mr. B. by myself, which I did. He promised to follow my advice. Last night as the people were moving to go, Mr. Reffell arose and addressed the people. He spoke very pleasingly, and begged them to remember what they had heard, and follow the advice I had given them."—pp. 339, 340.

We quote an interesting anecdote illustrative of the power of conscience :—

"A circumstance occurs to me, which happened on Saturday, which I think is worthy to be related, as it will show how the Lord has favoured many of these dear people with tender consciences,

"Walking in my piazza, I saw a school-girl, a communicant, about seventeen years old, who is generally very steady, coming up the hill, with another girl, rather thoughtlessly, laughing and talking : which is unusual, as most of the people, at that time, when they have got every thing ready for Sunday, sit down and read their Bibles. When she had passed my house, I called to her, and said, 'Mary, what day is to-morrow ?' She made a full stop—cast her eyes to the ground—paused a while ; and then looked up with a sad countenance, and said, 'The Lord's day, sir.' Seeing that she was sufficiently reprov'd, I resumed my walk. When I turned about, I saw Mary standing at the other end of the piazza, and tears rolling down her black cheeks. When I came near, she made a low curtsy, and said, 'I thank you, sir ;' and then turned about and went to the school-house, and I have no doubt, fell on her knees and turned to her Bible."—pp. 354, 355.

We now come to the closing scene of this admirable missionary :

"It was about six weeks after the date of his last short note, when Mr. Johnson, having received the above permission, and having made the best arrangements in his power for supplying his place during a brief absence,—embarked on board the 'Betsy and Anne,'—which vessel had, a short time previous, brought Mr. Düring back to Sierra Leone. The infant daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Düring was committed to his care, their only surviving child, they having lost their son, a fine child, between two and three years old, a few days before. A young native woman, one of Johnson's communicants, accompanied them to take care of the child : a circumstance providentially ordered, as will presently appear.

"Mr. Johnson embarked in apparently the soundest health, but on the third day of sailing, the seeds of the fatal disease, which he must have carried with him on board, began to exhibit their effects. The

day after which, Wednesday, the fever increased so that he began to anticipate the worst. On Thursday a blister was applied to his chest without any favourable result. On Friday the disease had made such progress that he could not turn in the bed:—the cough now came on, and he suffered much from the black vomit. ‘I think I cannot live,’ he observed to his weeping attendant.

“Just after his embarkation, he had addressed a letter to his coloured people, exhorting them to continue in the grace of God; so anxiously did he at all times regard the work which the Lord had given him to do; and in his dying moments, he did not forget the many claimants on his paternal affection, whom he was about to leave behind him.

“On Saturday, May the 3rd, he had intervals of delirium, during which he called on David Noah, his faithful native assistant at Regent’s Town, and on his faithful friend Düring, saying that he wished to tell them all that he had to say before he died. When composed, he expressed an earnest wish to see his wife, and spoke encouragingly to his poor convert, who waited on him with the tenderest solicitude, striving to calm her fears, and directing her how to proceed on her arrival in London. He asked her to read to him the twenty-third Psalm; ‘and when,’ said she, afterwards relating these melancholy particulars, ‘I had read it, he said to me, ‘I am going to die—pray for me.’ I prayed the Lord Jesus,’ she added, ‘to take him the right way.’ He afterwards charged her to take good care of Mr. Düring’s little girl, and to desire the Society to send a good minister to Regent’s Town, as quickly as possible, or the people would be left in darkness. ‘If,’ said he, ‘I am not able to go back, you must tell David Noah to do his duty; for if Noah say, ‘Because massa dead, I can do nothing,’ he must pray, and God will help him, and so we shall meet in heaven.’ His last intelligible words were, ‘I cannot live, God calls me, and this night I shall be with Him.’”—pp. 398, 399.

We must now offer a few concluding remarks on the volume before us. The earliest religious impressions of this devoted man appear to have been derived from sources unconnected with the Church of England, and which are in some degree liable to the imputation of enthusiasm. And accordingly there is a species of phraseology running through his journals, and a class of ideas which, amidst all their piety, betray evidences of a sectarian origin; and we should say that the effects of his preaching in exciting the feelings would show some want of judgment on his part. At the same time we must remember the exceedingly impressible and excitable natures of the Africans; and also the fact, that the love of this admirable man for his hearers was evidently so intense, that it could not fail to affect most deeply all who came within its influence. On one occasion he expressed the feeling, that if he had ten thousand lives he would give them to save one African; and he lived in the daily peril of death for

their sakes. Almost continually himself visited with symptoms of the fatal malady which was carrying off all his fellow-labourers—and fully persuaded that the climate of Sierra Leone was the worst in the whole world—he was so enwrapt in the welfare of his people, that he deliberately declared that he could not *live* elsewhere. Can it be a matter of surprise that one who was so intensely absorbed in the love of souls, should have exercised a most extraordinary influence, and carried all hearts along with him, as it were, by a miraculous agency?

It is a matter of thankfulness to hear from the volume before us, that the work so nobly commenced by Mr. Johnson, has never ceased to exercise its hallowed influence, though for a long series of years this Mission was, from unavoidable circumstances, left almost without pastors. It still survives; and we trust that the devoted bishop who has just been sent forth to this distant and perilous station, will be enabled to renew the great and glorious work from which this holy missionary was prematurely removed.

- ART. VII.—1. *Dr. Wordsworth's Sermons on the Irish Church.* Rivingtons. 8vo, pp. 295.
2. *A Fortnight in Ireland.* By SIR FRANCIS B. HEAD. Murray. pp. 400.
3. *The Irish Church. Its History and Statistics.* By WILLIAM SHEE, *Serjeant at Law, M.P.* London: Aylott and Jones. Dublin: James Duffy. pp. 228.
4. *Reply to Serjeant Shee.* By ARCHDEACON STOPFORD.

OUR readers may remember that, in our number for last July, we commented at considerable length on the theory, not the old-fashioned, but the modern theory of "religious liberty," or, as it is now called, of "religious equality." Since that time, the theory in question has assumed a new feature, with respect particularly to the Church of Ireland. An association has actually been formed, under the auspices of the Romish hierarchy, and, mainly, by the instrumentality of Mr. G. H. Moore, not for the spoliation, and demolition, and destruction of the Irish Church—such an object would be at once scouted by all right-thinking persons, even in Ireland—but merely for the purposes of "appropriation," of "religious equality," of just and legitimate "restoration." In plain terms these men are modest enough not to put on the face of their proceedings the intention of Mr. Lucas—that Irish Lion, who, in the English House of Commons, "roars as gently as a sucking dove," as we fully foresaw he would do—the intention, we say, of Mr. Lucas to "subvert" the Establishment, to cut it off root and branch as a cumberer of the ground—they merely propose to rob the Irish Church of a moiety of her lawful possessions, for the purpose of endowing with the plunder, not simply her most bitter enemies, but the most bitter enemies also of the Irish country and the Irish people. And this modest plan is recommended to the people of England, not by Irish demagogues, like Mr. Lucas, but by an Irish gentleman of very high standing at the English Bar, who was returned in the last Parliament for the county of Kilkenny. Any thing from the pen of Serjeant Shee is entitled to our respect, even though our differences of opinion may be as wide as they well can be. We have not forgotten his chivalrous disavowal, at the Rotunda Meeting, of the vile persecution, in Tuscany, of the poor Madiais, a per-

secution which, of course, Mr. Lucas zealously defended. We are only very sorry to see a gentleman like Serjeant Shee mixed up with such a "rabble rout" of persecuting spoliators as compose the "religious equality association"—an association whose members, actuated in reality by a purpose which they dare not openly avow to the world, are compelled to mask under a false and specious title their design of destroying and subverting the Irish Establishment. We can fancy how Dr. M'Hale and Mr. Lucas—*par nobile fratrum*—must have chuckled over the good-natured simplicity of the learned member for Kilkenny, when they find him disavowing, and we believe with perfect sincerity, any intention, or even desire, of injuring the Irish Church. "Truth to say," says the learned Serjeant, in a passage which reflects the highest credit on himself personally, while it proves him very far too honourable a man for the party with which he is connected:—

"Truth to say, there is nothing in the scale or pretensions of the greater part of the Protestant churches or glebe-houses in Ireland, which ought, after proper arrangements made for their own Church, to offend the Catholic people. Truth to say, the abolition of parochial assessments for church purposes, and the conversion of tithe into rent-charge, have materially diminished the annoyance and burthen of the Establishment. Truth to say, its clergy have not generally been wanting, during seasons of disease and famine, in acts of neighbourly kindness to those by whom their spiritual services are rejected. It is time to exhibit, in the shape of a definite scheme of Church revenue appropriation, a practical proof of the sincerity of our repeated declarations, that we seek not to subvert the Establishment, as settled by law within the realm. . . .

"It is a convenient rule for those who take part in public discussions out of Parliament, so to shape their schemes of reform as not to transgress the bounds by which they, and those whom they expect to support their views, might find themselves controlled had they the opportunity of promoting them—in Parliament. On this question, a Legislature of Church of England men has marked out for its own observance, probably for many years to come, but certainly for the guidance of Catholic members, a line of parliamentary conduct from which, if they hope to effect any practical good for their co-religionists, it is their true policy not to swerve. They cannot enter parliament without a solemn adjuration of all intention to subvert the Church Establishment; they must faithfully promise to defend the settlement of property established by the laws, and not to use any power or privilege of which they may become possessed to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom¹."

¹ Shee's *Irish Church*, pp. 213, 214.

Has Serjeant Shee, the writer of this passage, ever seen the oft-repeated declaration of the *honourable* member for Meath, Mr. Lucas? For the sake of contrast, we will give him the opportunity of reading it:—

“By the blessing of God in heaven,” said Mr. Lucas at Kells, “I will never rest nor cease my exertions, so long as I am in any position to exercise any public functions whatever, until that accursed monopoly, the Established Church, **BE CUT DOWN BY THE ROOT.**”

And this man has solemnly sworn, at the table of the House of Commons:—

“I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and **ABJURE** any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, as settled by law within this realm—**SO HELP ME GOD!**”

This is the man, with whom Serjeant Shee, honourable, high-minded gentleman as we verily believe him to be, this is the man with whom Serjeant Shee delights to take counsel—with whom he condescends to fraternize for the purpose of robbing the Irish Church! We warn Serjeant Shee that he must either, and that speedily, break off such a connexion, or he must expect to incur a similar measure of justly merited condemnation.

Our space will not allow us to go into the details of Serjeant Shee's book, nor indeed is it necessary to do so, because, as we shall prove before we have done, his statistics cannot be depended on for a single moment. Suffice it, briefly at present, to state that, for the purpose of “conciliation and peace,” he proposes, by various methods, such as reduction of the incomes of bishops, curtailment of the usual payment for expenses of public worship, taking half the average of the sums annually expended by the ecclesiastical commissioners in building churches, &c. &c., to raise a fund, to be divided between Presbyterians and Roman Catholics, for the support of their respective religions. The “Protestant Establishment” is in no way whatever to be weakened by this plan, but, we presume, its general efficiency to be rather improved; and thus members of the Irish Church, Romanists, and Presbyterians are, henceforward, to dwell together as “an united happy family”—all is, for the time to come, to be harmony and peace! Surely there never was a case to which the line of the Roman satirist was more applicable, *Spectatum admissi, risum teneatis, amici?* Granting, for a moment, the justice, the wisdom, the expediency, of this lucid arrangement, we ask Serjeant Shee, as an honest man, does he himself believe, for a single moment, in its practicability? Does he think it would ever work? What! “Archbishop” Cullen, and the “Lion of

the fold of Judah," and Mr. Lucas, and Mr. Wilberforce, *et id genus omne*, consent to be placed merely on a level with any other religious denomination! They, whose watchword is, not "Ireland for the Irish," but "Ireland for the Church of Rome," are they, forsooth! to sit down quietly contented with a moiety? Are they to recognize, as, on Serjeant Shee's plan, they plainly must recognize, the ecclesiastical *status* of the "Saxon heretics?" Surely Serjeant Shee must be very ignorant indeed of the real principles of those with whom he associates in pursuit of "religious equality," or else he cannot be sincere in proposing a plan which is utterly opposed to the arrogant pretensions and haughty insolence with which the Romish Church invariably thinks fit to regard those without her pale. From Mr. Bright we can receive such a proposal, and only laugh at it; but it assumes a very different aspect indeed when propounded by a Roman Catholic, who, from the very position he at present occupies, is brought into intimate fellowship with the most extreme members of his own exclusive communion. We trust Serjeant Shee will take some notice of this point in his next edition. We wish ourselves to respect him as a straightforward man, but certainly his sagacity *or* his straightforwardness seem very strangely impeached by his present proposal. He either knows very little indeed about his own Church, or he is not honest in the arrangement he proposes for her adoption,—an arrangement utterly opposed to every principle on which she has hitherto acted.

But let us now consider, not the practicability, but the justice of this proposed arrangement. Has the English Parliament a right to confiscate the property of the Irish Church—any portion of that property—for the benefit of Irish Romanists? That will be our first article of inquiry in this paper. Next we shall inquire, whether, supposing the right cannot be proved, is it expedient, "for the sake of conciliation and peace," to adopt Serjeant Shee's plan? In other words, have the Romish priesthood, by their past conduct, deserved that endowment, as a favour, which they cannot legally and morally claim? Have they been loyal and obedient subjects? Have they trained their flocks in the principles of peace and love? Have they discouraged turbulence and sedition? Have they caused their own personal characters to be respected? Are, in short, the fruits of their teaching such as to render it desirable, for the sake of "conciliation and peace," not simply to place that teaching on a more definite footing, but to extend, and increase, and foster it to an hitherto unheard of extent? This will be our second article of inquiry. And then we shall inquire, lastly, whether, granting either the justice or the expediency of adopting the proposed arrangement, Serjeant

Shee's plan is practicable—whether it can, practically, be carried out. These are the three points we have especially to consider in this paper. And we are, fortunately, at no loss whatever for material wherewith to answer each of the questions we have just propounded. It does seem well nigh a direct interposition of DIVINE PROVIDENCE, that, at the very precise period when the Romish Hierarchy, by the aid of the “religious equality association,” are preaching a new crusade against the Irish Church, a volume of sermons, such as that of Dr. Wordsworth, should have been given to the world,—a volume, we hesitate not to say, destined to exercise an incalculable influence upon the future prospects of the Church of the “Island of Saints.” In no spirit of flattery towards Dr. Wordsworth—flattery which he would scorn to accept, as much as we to offer—do we express our deliberate and decided conviction, that it is impossible at present to estimate, in any thing like an adequate degree, the benefit which we fully believe will accrue, by God's blessing, to the Church he has defended with such learning, eloquence, and zeal. We only regret that the limits at our command will prevent us from laying before our readers more than a cursory abstract of the contents of that volume. We do earnestly hope that the time will shortly come when, by the publication of the text of his sermons on the Irish Church, in a form and at a price adapted for general circulation, Dr. Wordsworth will leave every one, who cares any thing whatever about the subject he has exhausted, without a shadow of excuse for future ignorance respecting her real history and her real position.

Our next question will be answered by a reference to the result of a visit recently paid to Ireland by that prince of tourists, and most shrewd of observers, Sir Francis Bond Head; while for an exposure of the, we doubt not unintentional, blunders committed by Serjeant Shee, we shall refer our readers to the answer of Archdeacon Stopford to that gentleman's, so-called, “History of the Irish Church.”

Let us then see how far Dr. Wordsworth's volume will furnish us with materials for discovering which of the two Churches at present existing in that country, is the ancient Catholic Church of Ireland—for that, after all, is the real question to be considered. If Serjeant Shee can show us that the Church to which he belongs is entitled to that appellation, then we willingly allow that his proposed plan falls very far short of the real merits of the case, is but a very trifling instalment of long-delayed justice. If, on the other hand, his Church be not the old Catholic Church of Ireland, then he will find it very difficult, if we mistake not, to persuade the English Parliament

to rob and plunder that which is the true Church, for the sake of endowing a schismatic community. Now on this particular point we would commend to Serjeant Shee's very special notice the following quotation from Dr. Wordsworth:—

“Among the pre-requisites for the attainment of this object, one of the most important is, that the public mind, both in this country and in Ireland, should be disabused of certain fallacies concerning the history of Christianity in that country, and should be rightly informed on that subject.

“For a long time, the advocates of Romanism in Ireland, have been commonly permitted to appropriate to themselves the venerable and attractive words, ‘the Old Religion,’ ‘the Ancient Faith,’ ‘the Church of the Fathers.’ Thus, many among ourselves have been led to imagine that these phrases are synonymous with the Religion and the Church of Rome. On this ground some have gone so far as to affirm, that to encourage and endow Romanism in Ireland would be only a work of Justice and an act of Restitution. And, on the same principle, it has been asserted by some, that the hundreds and thousands of Irish, who have recently renounced the errors of Rome, have, by so doing, abjured the faith of their Fathers, and have embraced a new Religion. It is time that the light of History should dispel these illusions. It is time, that they who hold this language should be called upon in the name of Him Who is the Truth, to substantiate what they say. *Produce your cause, saith the Lord; bring forth your strong reasons.* Let us not have assertions, but proofs. Let them show,—if they can,—that the Bishop of Rome exercised supreme authority in Ireland for a thousand years after Christ. Are they able to do so? No, my brethren, the truth is—and it is time that the truth should be known by all,—that Romanism in Ireland is a new religion, that it came in by stealth, in an age of darkness; and that the renunciation of the Papal Supremacy is not an act of apostasy, (Heaven forbid!) but a right and necessary exercise of Christian Liberty; and if it be coupled—as it ever ought to be coupled—with the reception of Holy Scripture (interpreted by Antiquity) as the supreme Standard and all-sufficient Rule of Faith, then it is a blessed *return* to the *Old Religion*, the religion of ancient Ireland, the Religion of the Island of the Saints, in her purest and happiest days.

“If this can be clearly shown (as it is my belief it may, and with God's blessing it is my hope to prove it can), then an unspeakable comfort will thence arise to those who abjure Popery, and a strong motive will thus be presented to others to follow their example. They will feel that by ceasing to be Papists, they become better Patriots; that they indentify themselves with their own ancestors of their earliest Christian History, and with the noblest and most glorious associations of their native land, and that they are recovering their ancient religious privileges, to which it owed its happiness and glory².”

² Sermons on Irish Church, pp. 11—13.

With a view of showing the falsity of Romish assertions on this point, Dr. Wordsworth, in his second sermon, enters fully into the history of the Apostle of Ireland, as he may well be called, ST. PATRICK. He proves clearly that the venerable saint, probably by birth a Scotchman, had no connexion whatever with the See of Rome, and consequently that her claim to a Supremacy over the Irish Church, in consequence of St. Patrick's mission, is a false and idle claim. Dr. Wordsworth then gives St. Patrick's "Confession of Faith," which we must quote at length, giving, at the same time, the deductions which, by every principle of logical inference, must plainly be drawn from that Confession:—

"And what was his doctrine?

"At the commencement of the same work he has inserted his own profession of Faith. It bears a strong resemblance to the Nicene Creed.

" 'There is no other God' (he declares) 'besides God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ, Whom we confess to have been from everlasting with the Father, and Who was begotten before all things, and by Whom all things were made, visible and invisible, and Who was made man, and overcame death, and ascended into heaven to the Father. And God gave unto Him all power over every name in heaven and earth, and under the earth, that every tongue should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord and God. We believe in Him, and expect that He will come again to judge the quick and dead, and will render to every man according to his works; and He has poured out upon us abundantly the gift of the Holy Ghost, the pledge of immortality, Who maketh us to believe and obey, and to be sons of God the Father, and to be fellow-heirs of Christ Whom we confess; and we adore One God in the Trinity of the Sacred Name.'

"Such is the CREED of ST. PATRICK, set down with his own hand, at the close of his long life, in the Volume which he left as a bequest to the people of Ireland.

"What, therefore, shall we now say? With feelings of respect and affection, we address ourselves to our Roman Catholic brethren in the Kingdom of Ireland. Take the Creed of St. Patrick in one hand; and take the Trent Creed, or Creed of Pope Pius IV., in the other. Place them side by side. Compare the two. The Trent Creed, which Rome now imposes on all Ecclesiastics, has added twelve Articles to the Nicene Creed, which we hold; and it declares that belief in those twelve Articles is necessary to everlasting salvation. It says, 'Hæc est Catholica Fides, extra quam nemo salvus esse potest.' Now, let us inquire, Do you find those twelve Articles in the Creed of St. Patrick? One of those Articles is an assertion of Roman Supremacy. Do you find that there?—No. Another is, Obedience to the Pope. Do you find that there?—No. Another is, Belief in Transubstantiation. Another is, Belief in Purgatory. Do you find them there?—No.

Another is, Communion in one kind. Is that there?—No. Do you find a single one of those twelve Articles there? No, not one. And yet you assert, that a belief in all these Articles is necessary to salvation, and you denounce us as heretics and innovators, because we do not, and cannot, receive them. What! if all these are necessary, how is it that St. Patrick does not mention one of them? Was the Apostle of Ireland a heretic? If so, *we* are content to be heretics with him. We are satisfied with his Creed. We hold every Article of it. And we leave it to you to consider, whether, if you are not content with St. Patrick's Creed, you ought to claim St. Patrick as your Apostle,—or, if you desire to have St. Patrick as your Apostle, you ought not to be content with your Apostle's Creed?

“Once more. As we have observed, St. Patrick's Confession is an autobiographical memoir of his ministerial career.

“If now, St. Patrick had been sent to Ireland from Rome, if he had been ordained at Rome, if he had been dependent on Rome, and had supposed that Ireland was subject, either temporally or spiritually, to the Roman See, he would have intimated in his Confession that this was the case. Your Bishops now call themselves, Bishops by the Grace of God and the Apostolic See, meaning thereby the See of Rome. St. Patrick, the first Bishop of Ireland, would have done the same. But now refer to his own life. Open his Confession. Does he state that he received his ministerial authority from Rome?—No. Does he say that he and his flock are subject to Rome?—No. What then, does he say of Rome? He mentions the Clergy of Ireland; he mentions the Clergy of Britain; he mentions the Clergy of France; but he never mentions the Clergy of Rome. The words Roman Bishop, Roman See, are not to be found there. The name of Rome does not occur once in his work. I leave it to you, my brethren, to draw the necessary inferences from these memorable facts.”

In his third sermon, Dr. Wordsworth considers the Irish Church in the age of St. Columba, and draws a very beautiful picture of her then happy and flourishing condition. We can only find room for one striking passage:—

“More than a thousand years ago the Church of Ireland was the *burning and shining light* of the Western World. Her Candlestick was seen from afar, diffusing its rays, like the luminous beacon of some lofty Lighthouse planted on a rock amid the foaming surge of the ocean, and casting its light over the dark sea, to guide the mariner in his course. Such was the Church of Ireland then. Such she was specially to *us*. We, we of this land, must not endeavour to conceal our obligations to her. We must not be ashamed to confess, that with regard to Learning,—and especially with regard to *Sacred Learning*,—Ireland was in advance of England at that time. The sons of our nobles and gentry were sent for education thither. Ireland was the

* Sermons on Irish Church, pp. 44—48.

University of the West. She was rich in Libraries, Colleges, and Schools. She was famous, as now, for hospitality. She received those who came to her, with affectionate generosity, and provided them books and instructors. She trained them in sound learning, especially in the Word of God.

"Nor is this all. We, my brethren, are bound to remember that the Christianity of England and of Scotland was, in a great measure reflected upon them from the West, by the instrumentality of Irish Missionaries, especially of those who came from the Scriptural School of Iona. That school was founded in the sixth century by St. Columba. He came from Ireland. He was of her ancient line of Kings. He is justly regarded as the Apostle of the Highlands and Western Isles of Scotland. And if (as we have already seen to be probable) St. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland, was a native of Scotland, both countries may find pleasure in the reflexion, that Ireland repaid the debt, and sent an Apostle to Scotland in the person of St. Columba⁴."

But we approach an epoch in Irish Church history of very grave importance, and one we must consider carefully. Dr. Wordsworth proves to demonstration, that, from the introduction of Christianity in the fifth century down to the seventh and eighth centuries, there are not the faintest traces of the Church of Rome having exercised the slightest spiritual domination over the Church of Ireland. But, in the ninth century, Ireland was invaded by the Danes, who established themselves principally in Dublin, Limerick, and Waterford. Being converted to Christianity in the tenth century, these invaders did not unite themselves, as they should have done, with the ancient Church of Ireland, but, claiming affinity with the Normans, already planted in Britain, they procured consecration for their bishops from the see of Canterbury; and thus, the English Church being then under subjection to Rome, in the course of the next century a footing was first gained for Rome in Ireland,—a footing which she did not fail speedily to extend. A. D. 1106, the first Papal Legate, Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick, was nominated by Gregory VII. Then, A. D. 1171, came the invasion of Henry II. The petty chieftains of Ireland, worn out with internal dissensions, readily submitted to his sway. At the Council of Cashel, 1172, Ireland became, "temporally and spiritually, subject to England, and through England—to Rome." Then came the degradation of John, when the King of England did homage for his crown to a Papal Legate.

It is impudently asserted by Romanists, that we owe Magna Charta to the influence of the Romish Church. What says Dr. Wordsworth on this point:—

⁴ *Sermons on Irish Church*, pp. 71—76.

“ The Barons of England obtained Magna Charta from King John, and it is sometimes alleged by adherents of Rome that the Barons of England were Romanists, and that therefore we owe Magna Charta to Rome. But what is the fact ?

“ After the submission made by King John to the Papal Legate, the Pope, Innocent III., claimed England, as well as Ireland, as his own. The King had bound himself by an oath to the Barons that he would observe Magna Charta. But the Pope absolved him from that oath.

“ To cite the Pope’s own words, in a Bull still extant, ‘ We utterly reprobate and condemn this compact, and we forbid the King to observe it under pain of anathema.’

“ Rome condemned Magna Charta; she absolved the King from his oath to keep it; she interdicted him from observing it. And yet, it is said by some, that England owes Magna Charta to Rome⁵.”

We have next to consider the period which intervened between Henry II. and Henry VIII., a very interesting period to consider, and for this reason :—Rome tells us that the only method of tranquillizing “ unhappy Ireland ” is by bringing her under her dominion. But the answer is obvious. What is the most melancholy period in Irish history ? When did she groan under the greatest amount of crime, oppression, and misery. Precisely at that identical period, when Rome had the fullest sway, during those identical three hundred years between the two Henrys, when her rule was most absolute,—when, if ever, on her showing, Ireland should have been flourishing and happy. But she was then, as now, “ unhappy Ireland,” and then, as now, from the same cause, the baneful and pernicious influence of the Church of Rome. Dr. Wordsworth draws a striking picture of the misery of the Irish people during this period. We must extract the conclusion at which he arrives from the consideration of it :—

“ We are placed,” he says, “ on our guard against the specious allegations of those who would now persuade us that if Ireland is to flourish, she must accept the Rule of Rome. If she is to prosper, they say, Romish Legates must be received there, a Romish hierarchy must domineer there, Romish titles must pass current there, Romish Councils must be convened there,—and, if they would complete the picture of Romish domination,—Italian Priests must be beneficed there—Italian Prelates must levy tribute there,—Peter-pence must be paid there.

“ But to this we reply, Why do you speak to us of what might be ? All these things that you desire, have already been. Your wishes *have been* gratified ; your aspirations have been fulfilled five centuries ago. We do not ask for ideal dreams of the future ; we know—know too well—the stern realities of the past. Rome does, indeed, labour to

⁵ *Sermons on Irish Church*, pp. 111, 112.

beguile us by shows and semblances of sanctity. She has fastings, and prayers, and processions, and pilgrimages, litanies, and jubilees, religious houses, and confraternities:—she comes to us wearing on her head a halo of holiness. Thus she dazzles our eyes. But what says Christ? *By their fruits ye shall know them.* By her fruits we *have known* her. And now we need only say to these enthusiastic advocates of Roman domination in Ireland, who would regenerate that country by means of the Papacy, Look back first to the most glorious period of Irish History; and then look back to the gloomiest period of Irish History. Ireland knew nothing of Rome in the first period; she knew much of Rome in the second period; and then her *gold became dim, and the fine gold was changed into dross. How did the faithful city become an harlot! it had been full of judgment: righteousness had lodged in it; but now murderers. Her princes are rebellious, and companions of thieves: they judge not the fatherless, neither doth the cause of the widow come unto them.* These were the fruits of Roman ascendancy for which you so eagerly sigh. Enough of these fruits yet remains to satisfy you; for the tree still survives. And if it be permitted to strike deeper root, and to stretch its branches more widely, these fruits will abound more; and we know too well from the past what will be the result for the future⁶.”

And now, we approach the period of what Romanists call the “Great Schism,” but what we call, and God grant that we may never cease to do so, the “Glorious Reformation.” Dr. Wordsworth very ably replies to the *ad captandum* argument respecting the personal character of Henry VIII. He shows that God, in the Old Testament, is described as frequently accomplishing His purposes by very unworthy instruments; secondly, that Romanists have certainly no right, looking on their own history, to taunt us with respect to that monarch; and, moreover, however bad he might be, he was exactly what the Church of Rome herself made him! We must quote one passage here:—

“First,” says Dr. Wordsworth, “we would turn to our Roman Catholic Brethren and ask, May not their own argument haply recoil upon themselves? You affirm that Rome is the ‘Mistress of Churches,’ and that the Roman Pontiff is ‘Universal Bishop.’ But by *whom* were *those* titles conferred? By the Emperor Phocas. And who was he? a murderer,—another Zimri—who slew his master, the Emperor Maurice. And why were those titles bestowed by Phocas on the Roman Bishop and his see? From resentment against the Patriarch of Constantinople, and from ambitious desires to gain the favour and countenance of Rome to his own enormities. They were given by a sanguinary tyrant for a wicked purpose. Reproach us not therefore with the sins of Henry VIII. whom we *do not* recognize as Founder of

⁶ *Sermons on Irish Church*, pp. 145, 146.

the Church in Ireland, lest we remind you of the vices of one from whom the titles were derived, on which you claim the homage of the world.

"Again, let us desire you to recollect, *who* first subdued the Church of Ireland to the sway of *Rome*? King Henry II. And by whom was he invited to Ireland? By an adulterous Prince, Dermot Mac Murrough. And what was the character of Henry II.? You yourselves charge him with murder—the murder of one whom you have canonized as a Saint and a Martyr, Thomas of Canterbury. We know also that he was a faithless husband and a bad father. And you assert that he was brought to Ireland, not by any love of the Church, but from personal ambition. Strange it is that the *subjugation* of Ireland to Rome by such a prince as Henry II. should be a laudable work, although, as you admit, it was effected by evil men, acting from the worst motives, and yet you should not allow us to deny that the *emancipation* of the Irish Church from the thralldom of Rome by Henry VIII. was evil, because the agent employed by God to effect it was not a religious King, and was not swayed by holy desires'."

We must pass very cursorily over the proof which Dr. Wordsworth brings forward of the regularity and order with which the Irish Reformation was conducted. He shows that it was carried on by lawful Synods of the Church—that in 1551, a Synod of Irish Bishops received the English Liturgy—that in 1560-1, a Synod of Irish Bishops was held for "establishing the Protestant religion"—that all the Bishops of Ireland, except two, took the oath of supremacy, the only two recusants being the usurping occupants of the Sees of Meath and Kildare, from which Sees Queen Mary had ejected the lawful prelates, because they were married men—and that Ireland was gradually, but surely and quietly, conforming to the principles of the Reformation, until the excommunication of Elizabeth by Pius V., to whom, and to whom alone, all the subsequent miseries of Ireland are really to be attributed. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that the Romish Church in Ireland, as in England, is an usurping and schismatic Church. We must quote the very striking passage in which Dr. Wordsworth discusses this point:—

"Again, with respect to Church Government. They assert that the present Reformed Church of Ireland dates its origin from the middle of the sixteenth century; that it is a New Church, and, therefore, No Church.

"But not only do we deny this, but we desire them to look at themselves. According to the decrees of the Ancient Church, there can be but one Bishop in a Diocese, and one Archbishop in a Province; and

he who intrudes into a See already occupied by another, is guilty of schism, and is no lawful Bishop. Now, therefore, let us ask the present Romish Bishops in Ireland,—Who sent them? Who gave them authority to execute the Episcopal office in Ireland? Let them trace back their succession, if they can, even to the middle of the sixteenth century. Grant, for argument's sake, that they can do this, which is dubious. But, if they arrive there, there they must stop; they cannot go a single step further back. Their Ecclesiastical ancestors of that period were *not consecrated by Bishops of Ireland. The hands of the successors of St. Patrick were never laid upon their heads.* They started up without predecessors, uncalled and unlooked for. They were not of Irish creation; they came from foreign lands, from Italy and Spain; some of them sent under a curse from the Pope, if they refused to go. And wherefore did they come?—To seize upon Episcopal titles worn by rightful owners; to invade Episcopal offices executed by lawful rulers; to intrude into Irish Dioceses occupied by Irish Bishops. Thus they set up a new altar against the true altar; they raised up a new Priesthood and a new Episcopate against the ancient Priesthood and ancient Episcopate in Ireland; they were spiritual usurpers; they followed in the way of Jeroboam, and walked in the *gainsaying of Korah.*

“And by what means and instruments did they prosecute their work? Not by the arms of the Spirit, but by fire and sword. During the first ten years of Queen Elizabeth, Ireland was comparatively peaceful. It seemed as if she had now, at length, a promise of happiness. The Word of God had been made more accessible to the people. Many thousand printed copies of the Holy Scriptures were now, for the first time, circulated in Ireland. The Queen had given command that the Bible should be translated into the Irish tongue. There seemed to be One Church and One People. Then it was that the Bishop of Rome interposed and confounded all things. He excommunicated the Queen. Thrice he fulminated his anathemas against her. He pretended to dethrone her, and to give her dominions to a foreign power, and sent the Spanish Armada against her. He excited her subjects to rebel, and despatched emissaries into Ireland, who fanned the flame of civil war, and brought consecrated plumes, and banners, and beads, and Agnus-Deis, from Rome, and promised the same indulgences to those who fought against their Queen as he gave to those who warred against the Turks. Thus Ireland became the scene of a religious war. So it continued for near forty years. Churches were burnt and pillaged, and the work of Reformation was arrested. Such were the circumstances under which the predecessors of the Romish Hierarchy in Ireland were introduced into that country¹.”

And now, for the present, we must leave Dr. Wordsworth. We shall have to refer to him again, by and bye, when we come

¹ *Sermons on Irish Church*, pp. 226—229.

to speak of the NEW REFORMATION, which is now, with such wonderful rapidity, progressing in Ireland. We have said, we trust, sufficient to prove that Serjeant Shee's proposal, specious and moderate as it appears on paper, is really a fraudulent proposal, and can only be carried out by spoliation and robbery. If the Irish Roman Church be schismatic, as we have shown it to be—if the only Church which can trace her lawful and unbroken succession to the earliest periods of Irish Church history, be the Established Church—then, surely, Serjeant Shee can have no shadow of a right to take away the property of the one, for the purpose of endowing the other, any more than the English Parliament can have a right to take the revenues of the See of Canterbury for the purpose of endowing the “Archbishopric of Westminster.”

But we turn now to our second proposed subject of inquiry, viz.:—Have the Romish priesthood so conducted themselves in Ireland, as to have at all events a moral, if not a legal claim to attention, support, and assistance from the British Parliament? Fortunately, owing to the recent researches of Sir Francis Bond Head, we are at no loss for an answer to the question. We strongly suspect, that no traveller ever spent so short a time in a strange country, who produced such a mass of valuable information as the result of his visit. We regret, deeply, that we cannot give to Sir Francis the space and attention to which he is fairly entitled, but as we bring his testimony forward for a definite and specific object, we can only allude very briefly to the general contents of his able and interesting volume.

Sir Francis gives a very graphic account of the “National System of Education.” We must extract his description of the infant school department; and also the reflection which suggested itself to his mind after a thorough inspection of the routine of arrangements:—

“On proceeding,” he says, “to the infants' school, I found 300 of them in their playground, drawn up in four or five formal lines, just ready, with little monitors at their side, to tottle into school.

“Their faces were all clean, and they were waiting with serious countenances for the ringing of the bell, when, all of a sudden, in consequence of a little ‘soft nonsense’ I had whispered into the ear of the teacher in charge of their yard, she called out to them in a loud tone, ‘*Children! you may have five minutes more play!*’ By the explosion of gunpowder one could scarcely have scattered them more suddenly in all directions. In one second the formality of their position and countenances had vanished, and all over the gritty precincts of the yard they were, mostly with little bare feet, to be seen running, tumbling, jumping, and laughing. A lot of more intelligent faces and beautiful

complexions no one could desire to behold. Their glossy hair was of all colours.

“In the middle of the yard were two poles, but the amusement they appeared most to enjoy was scrambling up a steep inclined wooden trough, and, on reaching the summit, squatting down and, without the slightest attention to the adjustment of their clothes, sliding down a corresponding descending wooden trough, the *bottom* of which was not only highly polished, but literally worn into two little furrows by the endless friction that, by the inventive powers of the Commissioners, had been applied to it. In a few instances, as a great joke, a child, instead of sitting, went down this *montagne Russe* head-foremost, on its stomach or back as it preferred.

“Any one witnessing the innocent, happy joy of these children, would reasonably have hoped that the hand of Time would have been arrested, but, as usual, he was inexorable; the five minutes came to an end—the bell rang—the children, stomach versus back, fell out into five lines, and by word of command of her majesty the queen of their yard they once again tottled into their schoolroom.

“On arriving there in the morning they deposit their hats and caps in a basket placed at one end of each of their respective forms, and their bread (dinner) in another basket at the other end.

“In the schoolroom I found, seated in various directions, a number of very intelligent-looking female teachers, each of whom had suspended before her a picture. One represented the whole process of making bread, from the ploughing of land for wheat to reaping, thrashing, grinding, and baking. Another, the various preparations which leather undergoes, and the mode of making shoes. Another was a carpenter's shop, with delineations of all his tools. Another, as a trifling change, a representation of the solar system.

“Each poor teacher, like Prometheus on his rock, was chained to the picture she had undertaken to explain; but as she could not long continue to propound its contents to one group, the chief Superintendent every now and then, as if a wasp had stung her, gave a stamp and a whistle, on which each group of children, under a tiny monitor—in many instances not four years old, and who is changed every week—moved successively to the next picture, which was no sooner explained than, in obedience to another sudden stamp and whistle, these little butterflies, with their monitor, flew to sip the honey of the adjoining flower.

“In a neighbouring room I found a congregation of infants on benches raised one above another, merrily singing a tune, into which had been artfully slipped a very small portion of the multiplication table, and as this medicine evidently made them very shortly more or less drowsy (I saw one tiny sinner from the bottom of her soul give a decided yawn), the teacher artfully revived them by saying very softly, ‘*Let's take another sleep!*’ on which, with great glee, they all threw themselves backwards, an exertion and a joke combined, which on their being ordered to awake, completely revived them. One little girl, however, of about two years old, who had over-acted the part, remained

sound asleep; and, as, with her tiny mouth open, her glossy flaxen hair lay wild and loose upon her rosy cheeks, I strongly felt how unconscious she was of the parental endeavours which the Lord-Lieutenant, together with Commissioners the Archbishop of Dublin, the Archbishop Murray, Lord Bellew, the Lord Chancellor, the Bishop of Meath, the Right Hon. Alex. Macdonnell, and others of the highest attainments in Ireland, were making to impart, not only to her, but to 511,239 other children throughout Ireland, infantine habits of cleanliness and obedience, as also the inestimable advantages of an admirable education. And yet I could not help repeating to myself how lamentable is the reflection, that while, at an annual expenditure of 164,577*l.*, Parliament is assisting this great work, the Commissioners, although they have benevolently spared no pains in giving to the children they have undertaken to educate every temporal assistance that ingenuity could possibly desire, cannot to this day agree among themselves as to the admission of the Bible, or even in the construction of any simple Christian prayer in which the rising generation of Irish, Catholics and Protestants, might be taught to unite! In short, to the discredit of both religions, these children, who are taught so innocently to join together ‘with heart and voice’ in a harmonious song of national homage to their Sovereign, are literally, by the dark rules of the institution—which ‘exclude from the general school all Catechisms and books inculcating *peculiar* religious opinions’—strictly forbidden from exclaiming together with similar unanimity,—

“‘GLORY TO GOD IN THE HIGHEST, AND ON EARTH PEACE, GOOD-WILL TOWARDS MEN’.”

One subject, to which Sir Francis paid great attention, is, at the present time, of special interest, viz. the College of Maynooth. Our readers will be glad of the opportunity of obtaining some authentic information respecting that College. Sir Francis thus describes the method by which that information was acquired:—

“In a few minutes,” he says, “the door from the entrance-hall opened, and in walked the Vice-President, in his black gown. He appeared to be about 40 years of age; he was tall, light, and active, with a countenance not only exceedingly clever, but particularly mild and pleasing. He had my card in his hand; and I had scarcely apologized for calling upon him, as a complete stranger, when he replied, ‘You were Governor of Canada?’ I answered, ‘I was.’ And, rather to my surprise, he then added, ‘And you have taken the part of Louis Napoleon?’ As I did not want to enter into that subject, I briefly said, ‘I had;’ muttering to myself at the moment, ‘Well, you read the *Times* at all events!’ ‘Do you want,’ said he, ‘to see our College?’

“Of course I did; but as I was particularly anxious that he should

⁹ A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 38—41.

not consider I had come merely from private curiosity, I at once took my black note-book out of my pocket, and opening it, and displaying to him some ten or fifteen pages of pencil writing, I said very gravely, 'I yesterday took these notes of the system of Irish education pursued in Marlborough Street, Dublin. If you see no objection, I desire to take similar notes, not on theological subjects, but on the general management of this College.'

"For a moment I fancied I saw a very small cloud of reflection flit across the sunshine and serenity of his countenance; but it had scarcely vanished when he said, with great kindness of manner, 'I will show you every thing myself'. "

He then gives the following account of the Institution :—

"It appears that the establishment of the Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth, founded on Mr. Pitt's recommendation, in 1795, by the Irish Parliament in the reign of George III., consists at present of a President, a Vice-President, a Dean, two junior Deans, a Prefect of the Dunboyne establishment, who also acts as Librarian, a Bursar, and a Secretary to the Board of Trustees, composed of three Catholic Archbishops, seven Bishops, and four Irish noblemen.

"The Professors are of

 "Dogmatical and Moral Theology.

 Natural Philosophy.

 Rhetoric and Belles Lettres.

 English Rhetoric and French.

 Ecclesiastical History.

 Logic, Metaphysics, and Ethics.

 Humanity.

 Irish.

"There are also attached to the Institution, a Counsel, a Law-agent, a Physician, a consulting Physician, a Surgeon, a consulting Surgeon, two resident Medical Attendants, and lastly a Printer and Bookseller.

"For the maintenance of this establishment the sum of about 8000*l.* was annually voted by the Irish, and afterwards by the Imperial Parliament, from 1795 to 1807, when an additional 5000*l.* was granted for the enlargement of the buildings. From 1808 to 1813 the annual vote was 8283*l.*, and from 1813 to 1845 it was raised to 8923*l.* By the Act of 8 and 9 Vict. c. 25, the College, on the recommendation of Sir Robert Peel, was placed on a new foundation, and permanently endowed for the maintenance and education of 500 students, and of 20 senior scholars on the Dunboyne foundation, for the support of which the College receives from the fee simple estates of the late Lord Dunboyne 460*l.* a-year.

"Besides providing for the annual cost of commons, &c., for these 520 students, of allowances to the 20 Dunboyne students, and to 250 students of the three senior classes, and of salaries to the president,

¹ A Fortnight in Ireland, p. 76.

superiors, and professors, the Act above quoted moreover vested in the Commissioners of Public Works the sum of 30,000*l.*, for erecting the buildings necessary to accommodate the enlarged number of students, which at present amounts to 520.

“ The rules for their admission are as follows :

“ No applicant can be received as a student at Maynooth College unless he be designed for the priesthood in Ireland, be sixteen years of age, be recommended by his bishop, and unless he be competent to pass a prescribed examination.

“ The ordinary course of study requires for its completion five years, after which the student is deemed fit to be made a priest ; but those who, by their superior qualifications, have been selected for the Dunboyne establishment, continue their course for three additional years. The studies principally consist of Greek and Latin classics, rhetoric, mathematics, French, English composition, the historical books of the Bible, logic, moral philosophy, natural history, ecclesiastical history, theology, and the Hebrew and Irish languages.

“ The Vice-President explained to me, that within the territory of the College, which comprises about 80 acres, there are three separate sets of buildings, namely :

“ 1. One containing 390 senior students, composed of a sort of barrack, forming three sides of a hollow square (the front of this building is that with two wings, which I have already described).

“ 2. A new college just erected in rear of the old one by the Parliamentary grant of the 8 & 9 Vict. c. 25, forming also three sides of a hollow square.

“ 3. A large detached building of two fronts, containing 130 junior students whom, on their arrival, it is deemed advisable to keep for three years by themselves².”

The manner of living, and the opportunities of recreation, are thus described :—

“ At nine in the morning the students have breakfast, composed of bread and butter, with tea or cocoa. At three they dine (excepting on Fridays and fast-days, when they are restricted to eggs, puddings or pies, and potatoes) on meat, vegetables, bread, beer, and water. At eight in the evening they have a supper of bread and cocoa.

“ On descending we came into the hollow square, surrounded on one side by the entrance front, and on the other side by the dormitories I have just described, which occupy on each side three stories of 33 windows each. The space included by these buildings is an encircled green lawn, on which are growing very luxuriantly two dark yew-trees.

“ As a group of students passed us I asked the Vice-President whether they were ever allowed to go into the village? In reply, he told me that on Wednesdays they were permitted to take a walk under the guidance of the Dean ; that at Christmas and Easter they have a few days holiday, but remain in the College ; that in the summer they

² A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 76—78.

have 55 days' vacation, during which they are supposed to be delivered over to their bishop or parish priest. I asked whether those who remained at Maynooth during the vacation (this summer they amounted to upwards of 60) were allowed to go out? 'Oh, no,' he replied; 'a student with us is *always* under the inspection of his superior.'

" 'On the 3rd of September,' he added (I copied his words as he spoke them, and afterwards read them to him to see that they were quite correct), 'On the 3rd of September commences a 'spiritual retreat.' During the whole of that interval all the Superiors, Professors, and Students observe perfect silence, devoting themselves wholly to religious exercises, and communing only with God. So solemn is the separation from each other and from the world, that they are in the habit of taking leave of each other, by shaking hands and bidding farewell as if going on a long journey; and when it is over, in like manner, they meet each other as if after a long absence, as though they had not seen each other in the interim³.'"

Sir Francis gives the following extract from one of their books of devotions, which he found lying about:—

"A portion of it appeared to have been much thumbed, and, the leaves opening of their own accord at that particular spot, I read as follows:—

" ' Oh! Holy Trinity, one God, have	Honourable Vessel.
mercy upon us.	Vessel of Singular Devotion.
Holy Mary.	Mystical Rose.
Holy Mother of God.	Tower of David.
Holy Virgin of Virgins.	Tower of Ivory.
Mother of Christ.	Tower of Gold.
Mother of Divine Grace.	Ark of the Covenant.
Most Pure Mother.	Gate of Heaven.
Most Chaste Mother.	Morning Star.
Most Undeiled Mother.	Health of the Weak.
Most Amiable Mother.	Refuge of Sinners.
Most Admirable Mother.	Comfort of the Afflicted.
Mother of our Creator.	Help of Christians.
Mother of our Redeemer.	Queen of Angels.
Most Prudent Virgin.	Queen of Patriarchs.
Most Venerable Virgin.	Queen of Prophets.
Most Renowned Virgin.	Queen of Apostles.
Most Powerful and Most Merciful Virgin.	Queen of Martyrs.
Most Faithful Virgin.	Queen of Confessors.
Mirror of Justice.	Queen of Virgins.
Seal of Wisdom.	Queen of all Saints.
Cause of our Joy.	O Lamb of God, who takest
Spiritual Vessel.	away the sins of the world.
	Spare us, O Lord.'

³ A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 81—83.

“The little volume containing the above prayer was entitled ‘THE KEY TO HEAVEN’.”

And yet Romanists tell us that they pay no homage to the Blessed Virgin, which is in the slightest degree inconsistent with that entire devotion of heart and mind, which Scripture, in every page, directs us to pay to that DIVINE BEING in whom the spirit of Mary *rejoiced as HER SAVIOUR*!

We shall conclude our notice of Maynooth with a description of the daily routine of Students in term. It will be seen how minutely every moment of the time is marked out—how rigid is the rule under which they live:—

“They rise ordinarily,” says Sir Francis, “at 6. (In May and June at 5.)

" From	6	to	6½	Dressing.
"	6½	"	7	Prayer.
"	7	"	8½	Study.
"	8½	"	9	Mass.
"	9	"	9¼	Breakfast.
"	9¼	"	10	Recreation.
"	10	"	10½	Study.
"	10½	"	11½	Class.
"	11½	"	12	Recreation.
"	12	"	2	Study.
"	2	"	3	Class.
"	3	"	3·40	Dinner.
"	3·40	"	5	Recreation.
"	5	"	6·45	Study.
"	6·45	"	7	Recreation.
"	7	"	8	Study.
"	8 to about	8·12	Supper.	
"	8·12 to	9	Recreation.	
"	9	"	9½	Night Prayer.
Lights extinguished at 10.				

“I then observed to him that I was glad I had visited compartment A of the Library, as people in England were usually of opinion that Roman Catholics did not read the Bible.

“He replied in the following words, which I read to him from my note-book to ascertain—as I told him—that I had correctly copied them from his mouth.

“‘It is a rule of our Establishment,’ said he, ‘that every young man at entrance should be provided with a copy of the Bible, for his own individual use; and so solicitous are we for the observance of this rule, that our Procurator purchases a number of Bibles, one of which is

‘ A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 90—92.

handed by him to each student, immediately after his accession, if he has not already a Bible in his possession.'

" 'But,' said I, 'do you not alter or suppress some portions of the Bible?'

" 'On the contrary,' he replied, 'we admit *more* books of Scripture than most Protestants.'

" 'And,' said I to myself, 'if the Procurator of the College of Maynooth actually purchases a Bible, and *hands* it to every candidate for the Roman Catholic priesthood; and moreover, if Catholics admit more books of Scripture than most Protestants; what possible excuse can the Commissioners of Public Instruction in Dublin offer to God, or man, for virtually excluding the said Bible, throughout Christian Ireland, from the education of the Catholic and Protestant youth of both sexes?'"

In the second part of his book Sir Francis discusses at very great length the "degraded condition of the Irish people," and the origin of that degradation. He proves by an induction of particulars, into which our space forbids us to follow him, that this degradation is *not* to be attributed either to the Imperial Parliament, the British Government, the Irish Landlords, or the Irish people,—not, we presume, *mainly* to be ascribed, for we suspect that each and all of them have had a certain share in causing that degradation. He then puts this question:—

"ARE THE PRIESTHOOD OF IRELAND THE CAUSE OF THE MORAL DEGRADATION OF IRELAND?"

"I reply, 'THEY ARE?'"

"The affirmation of these two small monosyllables will of course excite the anger of those against whom they are directed; but, as it is in sorrow rather than in anger that I very deliberately make the assertion, I calmly defy all the talents, ability, sophistry, artifice, and indignation of the Irish priesthood to repel the evidence I am about to adduce, for the avowed object of degrading in the estimation of every Irishman, and most especially of every Irishwoman—to the proper level—a clergy who—*I will prove it*—have brought scandal on the sacred character of the Catholic Church, who have disgraced the cloth they wear, and who are culpably driving from a beloved soil hundreds of thousands of men, women, and little children, whom it was their especial duty spiritually and morally to befriend.

"As far as I am individually concerned I have no interest whatever in the prosecution of those whom I have thus publicly arraigned. I am in no way connected with them, with Ireland, with the Irish Government, with the Whig Government, or with Lord Derby's Government; but, like everybody, I owe a duty to my Sovereign and to my country, and, in performance thereof, I will at once proceed to substantiate what I have affirmed. All I ask of Ireland—in return for

the service I am endeavouring to render to her—is an unprejudiced hearing, a cool judgment, and an honest decision⁶.”

He grounds his assertion on the enormous amount of spiritual power wielded by the Romish priest through the agency of the Confessional, of Indulgences, of Excommunication, of suppressing parts of God's Word, and of the celibacy of the Clergy. He then alludes to a local instance of the power of the Irish priesthood, and then asks the following very pertinent and searching question:—

“And yet, how comes it, I emphatically ask, that with all these positions, and with all this superhuman power, the poor, good, virtuous Irish people, who, in fervent devotion to their revered religion, will proverbially do any thing that their priest bids them—how comes it, I ask, that, bound together only by Ribbonism, they are to be found almost every where, in squalid rags, living with their pigs and asses, and without metaphor, existing—most fearfully—with nothing between them and the far west of America but the rind of a round root, which it has lately pleased the Almighty to fester and corrupt before it even comes to maturity?

“Is it because the facility of cultivating that root, which supports dogs, sheep, fowls, pigs, *and children*, encourages early marriages; and that for every such early marriage the improvident couple is required to pay to a certain personage the exorbitant fee of 25*s.* to begin with, with a further demanded fee of 2*s.* 6*d.* for every child that it produces?

“Are the receipts of those fees the *latent* reason why every well-organized system of emigrating from such a degraded state has been strenuously opposed by the Irish priesthood?

“Is it to prevent the stimulating light of knowledge, which education would throw upon the Irish poor, that Archbishop M'Hale, and the majority of the Irish priesthood, have unceasingly opposed, and are still strenuously opposing, that national system of education, the beneficial effects of which I have imperfectly described,—just as they have opposed that legal provision for the poor which prevents the parish priest from remaining their sole almoner? And while a stranger, in travelling through Ireland, cannot give a little child a halfpenny without receiving in return the indigenous words ‘God bless your Arnh'r,’ why is it that the Catholic population of Ireland have been and are still taught to revile, as a bitter enemy, that generous benefactor, the British Parliament, which in the late period of their distress assisted them to the enormous extent of eight millions? In short, in plain terms, is it, or is it not, the interest and the object of the Irish priesthood to keep their flocks in their present state of degradation? For if it be neither their interest nor their object, why, I ask, have they neglected to teach those who have so implicitly confided in them, to maintain clean dwellings, to wear decent clothing, and to adopt a species of cultivation

⁶ A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 251, 252.

which would prevent them, to a considerable degree, from falling victims to a vegetable disease?

“Lastly,—I beg leave to ask, how comes it that the constabulary map at the commencement of this volume indisputably proves, to any one, *at a single glance*, that in the north of Ireland, where the poor are, generally speaking, under Protestant clergymen, as also on the western coast, where Protestantism has made great progress, there are infinitely less police stations—that is to say, there is infinitely less crime—than in the remaining portion of Ireland, where the poor are under the especial and almost exclusive care of the Irish priesthood?

“In reply to my queries, will the archbishops, bishops, and Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland affirm that really they are not invested with power or influence enough to produce that moral change which Major-General Sir Duncan M’Grigor and Colonel Brown—as it were by word of command—effect upon every Irishman that enlists either into the constabulary or into the Dublin police?

“In the face of the staring fact that Father Matthew—single-handed—prevailed upon millions of illiterate Protestant as well as Catholic Irishmen to drink cold water instead of warm whisky, will the archbishops, bishops, and Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland declare that the Church of Rome has gifted them with so little power, and such feeble influence over their flocks, that it would be utterly hopeless to advise them to break the wicked band of Ribbonism, which, as is well known, is composed *solely* of Irish Roman Catholics?

“The only calm and reasonable solution that can be offered of the phenomenon of an intelligent people living in the state of moral degradation I have so often described and bewailed, is either that their priests, whose influence over them is undeniable, are not gifted by the Pope with sufficient power, or that these Irish priests have had worldly objects in view, which, to say the least, have distracted their attention from the temporal welfare of their flocks; and on the horns of this dilemma I leave Archbishop M’Hale’.”

But Sir Francis does not content himself with bare theoretical assertions. He enters also, very minutely, into the practical part of the subject by an inquiry, “What has been the open aggressive conduct of the Irish Priesthood?” We only wish that we could insure the answer which he supplies to this inquiry, being placed in the hands of every British senator, when the “religious equality” question is brought forward in the House of Commons. Much of the proceedings of the Irish Priesthood at the recent elections we described in our last number. We must quote from Sir Francis, proof of the soundness of the reason we then gave for the desperate game the Irish Priesthood played at that election:—

⁷ A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 272—274.

"The Roman Catholic priesthood," he says, "clearly seeing that the 'Exodus' of their fee-paying flocks, whom they have invariably refused to accompany, was progressing; that every family settled across the wide blue waters of the Atlantic were beckoning to their compatriots to follow them; that 'millions of Catholic souls had been lost' in America; that the contagion was spreading even to the metropolis of their own country; and, lastly, that as the result of these united movements, by cholera, famine, &c., the Protestant population had so alarmingly increased, that it not only already nearly equalled, but that it threatened very shortly to overbalance in number (as it has always greatly overbalanced in wealth and in land) the Roman Catholic population of Ireland, felt that,—unless some bold and decisive movement was made by them to get into Parliament members favourable to their views, namely, 1st, 'tenant-right,' or a destruction of the title deeds of Protestant and Catholic landlords; 2nd, 'a reversion,' as Archbishop M'Hale has adroitly expressed it, 'of the ecclesiastical funds of the Protestant Church to their original purposes of promoting Catholic piety, charity, and education;' 3rd, the stoppage of emigration; and, 4thly, above all, the abolition of the existing combined Protestant-cum-Catholic education of the people under the direction of the National Board of Education in Dublin,—their power, like their flocks, would vanish from the land.

"Hitherto their masked influence had, as I have shown, been apparently simply negative. It was, however, only by positive force, by uniting together, and boldly casting aside their spiritual character,—in fact, by what may justly be termed 'taking the field,'—that they could hope to maintain their position. They therefore, as is notorious, virulently increased their opposition to education: although the population of Ireland had sunk from eight millions to six, they *increased* the number of their priests; and, as I have indisputably proved by *their own* evidence, they regularly organized a system for advocating, from the altars of their chapels and again in person on the hustings, hostility to landlords, to Lord Derby's government, to Lord John Russell's administration; in short, to every human authority and to every human power that should dare presume to offer to their temporal interests and objects the smallest opposition.

"Of the conduct and speeches of the Irish priesthood during the late elections, I received from gentlemen and persons of high character who were present, and whose names, if called upon, I can produce, statements, on the truth of which the reader may *implicitly* rely^s."

We may observe here that, since the meeting of Parliament, Mr. Vincent Scully very coolly called on Sir Francis to give up these authorities. His answer was of course a refusal to do any thing of the kind, but he, at the same time, pledged himself to

^s A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 363—365.

produce them, and to substantiate every one of his statements, *before a Committee of the House of Commons.* Will Mr. Scully move for such a Committee? We rather think not!

We proceed to give a few extracts, descriptive of the manner in which the Irish priesthood wielded the enormous power they possess over the minds and consciences of the Irish people:—

“On the 27th of June, the priest of * * *, after mass, addressed his congregation as follows:—

“‘The approaching election is not a war between two kingdoms, but it is a war against your religion; you ought therefore to vote for the Liberal candidates. * * * is a supporter of Lord Derby’s government, and if Derby gets a majority he will crush you; the Government has already done all in its power to crush your religion. Priests and nuns are prevented from wearing their religious habits; the people therefore should be ready to sacrifice their lives for the support of Liberal candidates. Those who have no votes should go to the houses of those who have, and if they will not go with you, *you know what to do*; and as regards myself, *I will not administer the last Sacrament, if they were dying, to any person who shall vote for the support of the present Government.*’

“On Sunday, the 25th of July, the priest of * * * spoke from the altar as follows:—

“‘I have to state, that those persons in this parish who yesterday voted for * * * are perjured men. Let them not come to me to speak about religion, for as long as I am in the parish *I will have very little to say to them.*’

“On the following day the seats of the persons alluded to were broken to pieces and thrown out of the chapel.

“On Sunday, the 1st of August, a woman whose husband had voted for * * * was turned out of church by the priest of * * *, who, striking her at the same time on the back, exclaimed, ‘Be off, mother of the old devil!’ (The poor woman was so frightened that she was confined to her bed for many days.)

“In the middle of the service of the mass, the priest, seeing this woman’s son, turned him out, too, saying,

“‘*I will not administer the Communion to any one while that man remains!*’

“When mass was over, the priest went into a house, where, happening to meet another son of the woman he had ejected from the church, he turned him out, saying,

“‘If I had but the * * * boys, *I would hunt your family out of fairs and markets.*’

“In the chapel of * * *, after mass, the priest addressed his congregation as follows:—

“‘One of you present has voted *for his landlord.* I tell you all that any cause *that* man undertakes will not prosper. The man that is base enough to vote against his conscience and his country, his name and his

children's names will be handed down to the tenth generation. If such a person should enter your house, *order him out!* If he remains, let every one in the house walk out; and when he goes to fairs or to market, let every one say, 'There goes the man *that betrayed his country!*'

"The priest of * * *, after mass was over, addressed his congregation as follows:—

"After denouncing 'landlords and their accursed exterminating system,' he said—

"'As long as you get your rights commit no offence; but if the days of Cromwell are to return, I will not stop your arms from the wild spirit of revenge. (Cries of Bravo throughout the chapel.) *May the curse of God* light on the Judases who have voted against you, and may their conscience torment them till they go and hang themselves as Judas did!'

"'Any man,' said the priest of * * *, after mass, 'who shall vote for a supporter of the Derby Government, his name shall be recorded to be handed down to posterity *in everlasting disgrace.*'

"After mass, on the 4th of July, the priest of * * * addressed his congregation as follows:—

"'Catholic freeholders of this parish, now is the time for you to show independence, by voting for * * * and * * *.

"'Any man that through fear of his landlord shall vote for the supporters of the present Government, I declare him to be *a perjurer.*

"'O'Connell called Lord Stanley a viper, and he has now brought forward a measure to prevent the Catholic clergy from appearing in their robes at any public meeting. *I shall visit you all* during the ensuing week'."

The Irish priesthood ought to be the especial conservators of the peace of the country. Let us see how they discharge their mission:—

"On the 29th of June the priest of * * * addressed his congregation as follows:—

"'The time is coming. I recommend that all of you get ready and have *your blackthorn sticks* and your *arms* prepared. Vote according to your consciences; but I tell you that he who votes for the *enemy* will not afterwards be able to live in the country.

"'Do not spare those who vote for the *enemy*, but yell after them in the streets, to *drag them and strangle them.* Vote for your *religion*'—and striking the altar with all his force, he added, 'for your God. Never will there be greater work in Ireland than on this occasion.'

"It will appear from the following speech, that from 'blackthorn sticks' the Irish clergy gradually but Jesuitically recommended the use of more deadly weapons.

"On Sunday, the 20th of June, the priest of * * *, in addressing

his congregation on the subject of the approaching elections, spoke from the altar as follows :—

“ ‘ I challenge Mr. * * * to see which of us shall have the votes of the people. How, I ask, can *his* voters get to * * *? for the colliers will be there with their picks. The law prevents them from carrying *arms*, but it does not prevent them from carrying their *picks*, because their picks are their tools¹.’ ”

Let us also give a specimen of the language sometimes employed by these Irish “ pacificators.”

“ The priest of * * *, addressing his congregation in favour of ‘ tenant-right,’ said,

“ ‘ These big-bellied bailiffs have fattened on the poverty of the people. I request the women who hear me to attend the election, and, if the *men* will not do it, I will get you women to *rip open their big bellies*.’ ”

“ On the 3rd of July the priest of * * *, in addressing from a window a mob of people, said,

“ ‘ Let us give three groans for * * * ; three groans for the Crowbar Brigade ; and nine times nine for *the Scorpion Stanley*. There are in this town some base, rotten, renegade, miscreant Catholics, who would, as at Stockport, pull down a chapel, and every thing in it, for a glass of whisky. But I will keep my eye upon them, and I hope, my friends, you will too. I don’t want *you* to use physical force, but I promise you that I will *pitch the silk into them* hereafter. There will be a public meeting in this town on Tuesday next, when the clergy of the diocese, and other influential gentlemen, will be present ; and I expect that *every man, woman, and child* of this and the adjoining parishes will be present to cheer on the champions of their religion, and to hunt the nominee of *Scorpion Stanley* from the field².’ ”

And what are the practical results of all this ? Let us see. Here are one or two of them :—

“ 1.

“ ‘ John Cunningham, take notice if you dont give your vote to the man whom it was asked for on Sunday last, you may have your coffin to Manorhamilton with you. So take warning in time, do as the rest of your neighbours do,—if you dont you will be shot *like a dog*.’ ”

“ ‘ A civil Caution.’ ”

“ 3.

“ ‘ Notice.

“ ‘ Take notice John Lang that you will not receive from the sooper John Colman any milk or if you do it is not a notice you will get but dedly wounds Sign buy me

“ ‘ CAPTAIN THUNDERBOLT.’ ”

¹ A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 371, 472.

² Ibid. pp. 373, 374.

“ 4.

“ ‘ To Mr. Turner * * *

“ ‘ Sir Take notice that if you go to give your vote against
—— you may quit both your mills: besides your life is in danger
also your son—in like manner.

“ ‘ You may please yourself, but mark what will follow.’ ”

“ 5.

“ ‘ To Mr. * * *

“ ‘ I herfore warn you if you go against us leave this place or lose
your life. You do not know the instant you or *your wife and child*
will be killed.

“ ‘ Tom and Short
without shame or fear ³.’ ”

Again :—

“ 8.

“ About half-past two o'clock in the morning of the 20th of July
about 40 persons came to the house of Michael Ledwith, situated in
the townland of Carrackateaur, and asked why *the priest* was refused
his oath? Ledwith replied, he did not refuse the priest! A book was
then handed to him by one of the party, when his son James swore on
it that his father should vote for Fox and Greville. They broke 9 panes
of glass in one window, and 2 sashes. They then went away, saying,
if he did not vote for Fox and Greville, they would again visit him and
level the house.

“ 9.

“ On the 18th of July seven or eight men visited John Geraghty's
dwelling-house at Cloonsheran on the night of the 18th instant, broke
the windows and door, and fired a shot into the house. Geraghty hap-
pened to be from home at the time. Two of the attacking party desired
his family to tell him that if he did not vote for *his clergy* and his
country, that they would visit him again after the election.

“ 10.

“ On the 13th of July, at 2½ o'clock A.M., ten persons called at the
house of Thomas Devine, situated in the townland of Carrickatrave,
called him up, and asked him for whom he would vote; he said for his
country and *his clergy*. One of the men, who had a gun, broke a pane
of glass by thrusting the gun through it. They then shook hands with
him and said that was all they wanted, and went away.

“ 11.

“ On the night of the 11th of July, about 11½ o'clock P.M., a party
of 9 or 10 men, two of them armed with pistols, and a third with a

³ A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 374, 375.

gun, came to the house of Denis Evers and obtained admission, after threatening to break in the door if it was not opened. When they entered they called for Evers, and asked for whom he proposed voting; he replied, for those he thought most worthy of it; and they then said that he should vote for *the Priest*, that he had been warned before, and that if they had to come again he might have his coffin made, for that they would shoot him and put him into it. They brought him outside the door, and told him to kneel down until they would shoot him; he refused doing so, and they then fired one shot close to his ear; he resisted, in consequence of which he received two cuts on the head: after repeatedly threatening him, they went away across the country⁴."

And now with all these facts before us we put it to Serjeant Shee whether he thinks it a very probable thing that a British Parliament will appropriate the undoubted property of the Irish Church to the support of a priesthood, who, as we have shown, have left no means untried by which Ireland should be rendered a byword, a reproach, and a hissing, among the nations. God forbid that we should ignore the fact that there are many, very many, Christian pastors among them, who are quietly and devotedly working out the high purposes of their sacred calling with zeal and devotion; but when we are asked to legislate for the Irish priesthood, we must take into account the many who strive to rouse the people to turbulence and rebellion, and not the few who strive to make them loyal and peaceful. But Sir Francis Head has discussed this question so forcibly, that we will not weaken his observations by any remarks of our own:—

"Now just," he says, "as in a Protestant Church the clerk officially exclaims 'Amen' to every prayer the clergyman utters, so, as might naturally be supposed, the illiterate congregations of the Irish priesthood outwardly and inwardly repeated the same word after every malediction which they heard their priest utter against Irish *landlords*; and, accordingly, following the example of their priest, or rather in obedience to his unholy mandates, *they* cursed as *he* cursed—*they* threatened as *he* threatened; *they* had recourse first to sticks, and finally to deadly weapons, exactly as *from the altar* HE had desired.

"In fact, the anonymous signature of 'TOM SHORT, *without shame or fear*,' and warning coffins, have, I believe, sufficiently explained to the reader how completely the Irish poor have been victims to the fury of their priesthood.

"THE SERPENT BEGUILED THEM, AND THEY DID EAT.

And what, I now ask of the priesthood of Ireland, has been the result

⁴ A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 376, 377.

of the guilty hatred you have inculcated between the tenants and the legitimate proprietors of the soil that have excited passions which, as Christian ministers, it is your duty to allay. In the name of God, and from you, with all the power of that education which the British Government gave you at Maynooth, you have not only denounced, but you have attacked the Irish *landlords*, but, diverting the enormous surplus of the land to temporal purposes of the most sordid kind, you have instigated your illiterate followers to the commission of the crime of MURDER; and, that there may be no misapprehension of the consequences of your eloquence, your imprecations, I call upon you, before the civilized world, to repent—may you repent—the following list of landowners, ‘tyrants, exterminators, and oppressors of the poor,’ who, in Irish graves, are now lying festering around, with fractured skulls and broken limbs, or with bodies mangled and shot, fired upon them as they were inoffensive and peaceable—as they were innocently cultivating the soil in several instances as, in the sacred enjoyment of their property, seated in their own homes, they were surrounded by their families, now mourning over their irreparable loss. . . .

“When this list of murders shall be affixed—as it shall be—to the door of every Roman Catholic chapel in Ireland, will any thereof dare to cross its threshold to administer the sacraments to a Christian congregation? Will virtuous Irishwomen kneel in prayer at the altar?—will they confess to him who, with his revengeful views, has been the means of turning and helpless children into orphans? Finally, when I ask the Irish priesthood, whilst this list of murders is before their eyes, themselves to declare whether I was not justified in my charges? ‘They have brought scandal on the sacred character of the Church—that they have disgraced the cloth they wear—that they are culpably driving from a beloved soil hundreds of the poor, women, and little children, whom it was their especial duty to protect and morally, to befriend?’

“MEN OF IRELAND! While in Italy, Germany, and Spain, the upper classes of society are what the philosophers call ‘philosophers’—our religion, said a German lady, in Ireland is the only country in Europe in which the priest, the lawyer, the judge on the bench—in short, the educated Catholic—is a sincere Papist. I respect your honesty,—I revere your devotion to the Christian creed,—and I should despise any one who would necessarily offer to your religion, or indeed to the religion of any country, insult or offence. But, without even a latent desire to convert you to Protestantism, I ask you, as men

talent, wit, ability, and courage, Are you not *ashamed of the conduct of your own priests* ?”

Before we leave our consideration of Sir Francis Head's volume, we are, very reluctantly, constrained to state that we differ from him, *toto cœlo*, in his concluding remarks. They who have followed us so far in our inquiry, will be scarcely prepared to find this distinguished writer advocating the continuance of the grant to Maynooth, and the residence of a British representative at the court of Rome. With regard to the first point, he thus graphically describes the total failure of Mr. Pitt's famous project for improving the character of the Irish priesthood :—

“In 1795 Mr. Pitt, conceiving that, if the Irish priesthood were to be forced to cross the Channels of Ireland and England to the Continent of Europe in quest of education, they would with religious instruction imbibe Jacobinical principles, proposed the formation of a home college, in which they might learn not only to be religious but *loyal*: in short, he conceived that he would secure the Irish priesthood to the throne by educating them in Ireland. His expectations, however, have been reversed; for while Roman Catholic priests on the Continent have always been in favour of monarchy or despotism, in Ireland *alone*, generally speaking, they have been, and are, liberals or republicans.

“But the establishment of the College of Maynooth has produced other disadvantages which might have been foreseen.

“If candidates for the Irish priesthood had continued to go for education to the Continent, the mere expenses they would have had to incur would have secured to the Church the sons of respectable people. With an opportunity of mixing with foreigners, their manners would have been polished, and their ideas enlarged. Indeed, in the French School of Theology at St. Omer there is very little of what is commonly called ‘ultramontanism.’ On their return they would thus have been fit to enter into the very best society of Ireland,—an intercourse of which the advantages would evidently have been reciprocal.

“Now, in the cheap wholesale manufacture of priests at Maynooth, there exist the following glaring errors :—Instead—like our young Protestant clergy at Oxford and Cambridge—of enjoying the advantages of association with gentlemen and noblemen of *all* professions, their education is exclusively confined to themselves;—indeed, the stone wall that environs them is but an emblem of that which is artificially constructed round their intellects, their minds, and their hearts; and as their life is evidently divested of all refined intellectual enjoyments, none but the sons of small needy farmers and small shopkeepers are willing to embark in it, and thus it may be confidently asserted

^s A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 384—387.

that among the whole of the Irish priesthood there scarcely exists the son of a gentleman. Indeed, the bishops of the various dioceses are practically aware that young men chosen from the very lowest ranks of society are more subservient to them than had they been selected from a higher caste; and it is on this account that in Ireland the Irish priest is rarely to be found in the society of a gentleman.

“In the class-books at Maynooth—for instance, in *Dens’ Theology*—ultramontane principles are irrevocably implanted in their heads; their discipline (*vide* the number of hours they are at study, page 95) breaks down their minds; abject subjection to their superiors crushes their spirits: in fact, not only is the system altogether one of utter slavery, but, I regret to say, it ends, as I have shown, in the slave becoming a tyrant.

“The addition to education money, granted in late years by Parliament, has not produced much improvement; for although it has undeniably increased the *number* of priests, it has not improved their *quality*. In short, Mr. Pitt’s project, in almost every point of view, has proved to be a most serious failure*.”

And yet, in the teeth of this failure, in the teeth of these lamentable results, he gravely deprecates any withdrawal of the grant, not because, as some say, the national honour is pledged to its continuance, which we altogether deny, but because of the enormous amount of evil which has resulted from it; because the conduct of the priests is really the best evidence against them; because it is of vital importance that we should not only satisfy, but undeniably prove to the civilized world, *who it is that has been to blame*. With great respect, we demur very strongly to the soundness of this conclusion. It is doubtless very desirable that the world should know the authors of Irish misery and Irish crime; but, as we are not to do evil that good may come, so we plainly have no right to encourage an institution, merely for the sake of the bad effects resulting from its establishment. We object to the endowment of Maynooth for three reasons. First, because we object on principle to the endowment of a false religion. Secondly, because of the results of that endowment. And thirdly, because of the aggressive attitude of the Romish Church both in England and in Ireland. We candidly acknowledge that, had the results of Maynooth been different—had we seen the Romish priests educated there quietly bringing forth *the peaceable fruits of righteousness*—had we seen them training up their flocks in habits of loyalty to their Sovereign and obedience to the law, we might have hesitated as to the propriety of disturbing an existing arrangement, to which, at the outset, we might have entertained grave objections. But when we see the very reverse of all this—

* A Fortnight in Ireland, pp. 394—396.

when we see the Romish Hierarchy hurling defiance at the majesty of the law—when we see the Romish priesthood inculcating principles which lead directly to sedition and lawlessness, to open violence and to midnight murder—then we say, let us, at any rate, wash our hands of any share in these foul transactions—let us sternly refuse to lend any longer the smallest support and the slightest assistance to any system which is proved, by unhappy experience, to lead to such frightful and terrible results.

And so, with regard to a British ambassador at Rome, we trust we may never see the day, when one shall be accredited there. We must not, in discussing this question, forget the special claims which the Bishop of Rome so arrogantly puts forward. If he were the mere temporal “Head of the Italian States,” and, as such, desired to interchange communications with the Court of England, no one could in that case fairly object to his doing so. But it is not so. The Bishop of Rome claims to be *gubernator orbis*—he assumes to himself the authority both of the sword and the keys—he pretends that it is his especial prerogative to set up and to pull down *thrones, and principalities, and powers*—and, so long as these claims are not withdrawn, so long must we refuse in any the slightest degree to recognize his pretensions. We must not forget that Rome professes to be unchangeable—that what has occurred, may occur again. We must not forget the lessons which history teaches us. We must not forget that that same power, which heretofore claimed the right of giving away the realm of England, has, only just now, claimed the right of parcelling out that realm as he pleased—of superseding our laws—of over-riding our constitution. Do any doubt that if, which God forbid, the time should ever come when Napoleon III. should seek to subjugate England to his sway, the “Head of the Italian States” would be fully prepared to bless that war as a “war of religion,” would be fully prepared to lend every assistance and give every sanction to the great work of rendering “the fair form of Catholicism” the dominant religion of England? Therefore do we say again, so long as the “Head of the Italian States” refuses to treat with us as a mere temporal prince, let us sternly resist every attempt, no matter by whom made, to bring about any recognition whatever of his power by the Court of England; let us steadily resist any endeavour, no matter what the present inconvenience, to bring about the appointment of a British ambassador to the Court of Rome.

But we purpose now to turn our attention a little more closely to the details of Serjeant Shee’s book. What will our readers think when we tell them that the statistics of the learned Serjeant

are perfectly worthless, that his calculations and deductions are not worth the paper on which they are written. The Archdeacon of Meath has proved this to demonstration in a "reply to Serjeant Shee," which ought to entitle the author to the earnest gratitude of every member both of the English and Irish Church. Taking Serjeant Shee's tables as they stand, he has gone through them *seriatim*, and a fearful amount of dry detail he must have gone through in his process of dissection. Certainly a more ludicrous series of "Irish blunders" were never published, than is contained in a volume, of which the purpose is to prove the wisdom, the justice, and the expediency of transferring Irish Church property to the use and benefit of the Romish communion. But our readers shall judge for themselves on this point.

The Archdeacon thus commences his reply:—

"If one must be engaged in controversy, it is a reason for thankfulness to have to do with an opponent who respects an oath, and who understands the courtesy of a gentleman.

"I trust I shall not be deficient in a corresponding courtesy to Serjeant Shee. It is not himself that I am going to pull to pieces, but the figures in his book.

"I feel it due to him to state, at the commencement, that, after a very careful examination of the book, I am convinced that he is innocent of the offences of those figures. I cannot believe that he had any thing to do with the getting up of them.

"I heard an eminent auctioneer once say: 'I am sure no lady or gentleman here would suppose me capable of telling a falsehood, when I should be so easily found out.' Now, giving Serjeant Shee credit, as I do, for a much higher standard of morality, I am also persuaded that even if this were not so, it is impossible that he should have knowingly so dealt with figures, when he would be 'so easily found out.' His character and his abilities equally forbid the supposition.

"I must, therefore, suppose, and I do feel convinced, that not a figure in this book was got up by himself—that persons were employed to get it up, who were unworthy of his confidence, and incompetent to deal with the subject; and that he was too much engaged with his other occupations to examine the book, or even to bestow one quarter of an hour in examining the principle on which its calculations were made.

"I feel it due to Serjeant Shee to express this my conviction; and thus to exonerate him, in the only way I can imagine, from any personal intention to mislead. The proofs of this will appear as I examine the figures of his book. At the same time I cannot wholly justify him in thus giving his name to a book of which it is impossible that he could have known the real merits. And it is also due to the public, and to the Church, to point out that we are not to suppose

that we have Serjeant Shee's personal character as a voucher for the correctness of its statements and figures. Those figures and statements must be taken as coming from some unknown persons, to whom Serjeant Shee too incautiously lent his name.

"Again, I entreat Serjeant Shee, and every one else, to keep in mind, as they peruse the following pages, that it is his figures that I attack, and not himself; it is his plan, and not himself, that I suspect. I may sometimes, for brevity, speak of Serjeant Shee as the author of this book, but I desire that it may be thus understood'."

We stated, above, that Serjeant Shee's plan was not one, even ought it to be, and could it be, carried out, which would, for a moment, satisfy his co-religionists. Let us hear Archdeacon Stopford on this point:—

"Serjeant Shee declares, that 'his opinion has always been, and he does not now feel at liberty to conceal it, that a scheme of Irish Church reform, to be proposed by Catholics to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, should be free from all suspicion of a design to subvert the Church Establishment, or weaken in its legitimate range of action the influence of the Protestant religion'—(p. 224).

"While giving Serjeant Shee full credit for sincerity, we must remember that he holds his seat in Ireland from the Roman powers. They made, and they can unmake him. They can use him as they did Henry Grattan in Meath; and they can replace him when it suits their purpose. And therefore, without the slightest imputation on Serjeant Shee, we must say, that while the heads of the Roman power in Ireland avow their intention to subvert the Established Church, no scheme coming from any instrument of theirs can be free from such suspicion.

"Serjeant Shee's attendance at a Meeting for Religious Equality, held in Dublin, October 28, does not tend to free his plan from such suspicion. I admire Serjeant Shee's manly conduct at that meeting on another subject, and it is with regret that I must allude to his attendance there with any other feeling. But I am bound to show on what grounds suspicion must attach to his plan.

"I take the Report of that Meeting from the 'Tablet' newspaper of October 30; I find this resolution: 'That the settlement of the Church question, on the basis of *perfect equality*, is essential,' &c.

"Now, does Serjeant Shee suppose that the 'Conference for Religious Equality' would consider his plan consistent with 'perfect religious equality?' He knows perfectly well they would not. He heard the mover of that resolution (Mr. R. Potter, M.P.) say: 'One of those duties was to secure for Ireland religious equality *in the fullest sense of the word*; . . . (he) trusted they would never relax their efforts

till *they* had *wiped out* ' (by Serjeant Shee's plan ?) ' for ever this stain upon the Irish people. . . . Many of the Irish people had shed their blood, and they were determined to persevere in the same course till they accomplished their purpose.' Serjeant Shee next heard Alderman Reynolds say : ' They were for complete religious equality ; *for the destruction of the iniquitous intercourse between Church and State*. . . . They were protesting against the giant evil of the Established Church in this country ; they were there as Catholics, to declare emphatically that they did not believe they were really emancipated, *so long as this badge and sign of degradation continued to exist*.' Did Serjeant Shee hear all this, and not know the meaning of the resolution : ' That the settlement of the Church question on the basis of perfect equality is essential,' &c. Yet Serjeant Shee did not then get up and say, ' that a scheme of Irish Church Reform, to be proposed by Catholics, should be free from all suspicion of a design to subvert the Church Establishment ;' but on rising, after hearing all this, he expressed himself as ' concurring in all the resolutions,'—that one, among the number, which he had heard so expounded.

" Now overlooking this apparent inconsistency in Serjeant Shee, and giving him full credit, as I do, for sincerity in respect of his oath, I cannot see how the plan of Irish Church Reform, proposed by one who so co-operates with such associates, can be regarded as free from all suspicion. Without personally suspecting Serjeant Shee, we cannot but suspect his plan *."

From the late hour at which the Archdeacon's very crushing "reply" has reached us, we cannot follow him very far in his inquiry into the accuracy of Serjeant Shee's *figures*. We will give however sufficient proof to satisfy our readers, how very desirable it would be if, the next time the Serjeant attacks Irish Church property, he would secure the services, not only of an able accountant, but of some one who really has some slight personal knowledge of the facts on which his statistics profess to be grounded.

For instance, it is part of Serjeant Shee's plan to cut down a variety of Irish livings to 300*l.* and 400*l.* a year, devoting the surplus to the purpose of endowing other communions. But let us see how he gets his surplus. Take, as an instance, the parish of Rathgraffe, in the county of Meath. Serjeant Shee puts the available income of this parish down at 501*l.*

Now Archdeacon Stopford shows, first, that the gross income, rectified by rent-charge, is only 472*l.* 5*s.* 9*d.* and, then, he thus exposes the fallacies of Serjeant Shee :—

* Reply, &c., pp. 3—5.

“The actual ‘income’ of Rathgraffe must now stand thus:

Gross income, rectified by Rent-charge . £472 5 9

Deduct:—

Rent of glebe £25 4 0

Quit-rent 13 4 5

Curate of Mayne 55 7 8

Visitation Fees 2 4 11

Interest on charge recoverable 7 7 8

Diocesan schoolmaster . 1 2 6

104 11 2

Available income, as in the return which

Serjeant Shee professes to give . . . £367 14 7

As stated by Serjeant Shee £501 0 0

“I have chosen this instance, not because the deductions are large, for they are small compared with many cases, but because it illustrates so many points. And it may serve to illustrate one or two more.

“A perpetual curacy and a district curacy have been established in remote parts of this parish since the return was made; a portion of the above income, amounting to 18*l.* 9*s.* 2*d.* has been allotted to those districts (the rest being made up by endowments and other private funds), the income of the incumbent of Rathgraffe is therefore, 349*l.* 5*s.* 5*d.*

“Now Serjeant Shee proposes, in page 217, to raise a surplus of 127,639*l.* by reducing all benefices to 400*l.* in the north and 300*l.* in Meath, and appropriating the surplus of those benefices. He must, therefore, have counted on Rathgraffe for 200*l.*; but 151*l.* 14*s.* of this surplus has disappeared already. And we have not yet considered poor rates. And though the incumbent has only 349*l.* 5*s.* 5*d.*, he has to pay poor rates on 454*l.* I will show elsewhere that 2*s.* in the pound is a fair estimate for this; and tithe rent-charge, unlike any other income in Ireland, pays full poundage. So out of 349*l.* 14*s.* the incumbent pays 45*l.* 8*s.* poor rate. And the benefice now not exceeding 300*l.* by any thing worth confiscating, Serjeant Shee’s whole surplus has vanished. And I am prepared to show that the very same thing will happen to his surplus from Irish Church income at large. In fact, his surplus consists wholly of income which the Clergy have not.

“If I succeed in proving this, I trust that his regard for his oath will prevent his proposing to make out a surplus by taking away from us what he has now recorded his opinion that we ought to have.”

We wish we had space to follow the Archdeacon through his exposure of the gross mistakes, with respect to other clerical incomes, committed by the learned Serjeant. We must find room for one pertinent question, which we think Serjeant Shee will be puzzled to answer:—

“Suppose,” says the Archdeacon, “such a case as this,—and many such cases occur,—an incumbent is entitled to receive 800*l.*; he is bound to pay away, or to allow, in poor rate, glebe-rent, quit-rent,

salary of perpetual curate, and other charges, 400*l.* Serjeant Shee professes to reduce this parish, if in the north, to 400*l.* per annum, and to appropriate the other 400*l.* But *which* 400*l.* does he intend to confiscate? This no where appears in his book. Will he leave the clergyman the clear 400*l.* to live upon, and take the other subject to its charges? If so, what becomes of his surplus? Or will he take the clear 400*l.*, and leave the clergyman the other, subject to its charges? If so, what becomes of the oath which he respects?

"I am sensible it is hardly fair to put such questions to Serjeant Shee. Such facts as these have not entered into his contemplation. He has put out his 'Statistics,' and calculated his surplus, knowing nothing of these things; and he cannot be expected to answer such questions now. But it is important that those who may be inclined to rely on his book should be aware of all this¹."

But let us see the account which Serjeant Shee gives of the living of Kells. We certainly, when we first read it, felt almost disposed to envy our friend, the Archdeacon, his singularly fortunate position. The living of Kells is worth, according to Serjeant Shee, 1553*l.* Pretty "snug lying" this, as Sir Lucius O'Trigger would say, for an Irish incumbent, with, of course, a snug parsonage, an Archdeaconry to boot, and nothing whatever to do for it—"Protestant parsons" in Ireland, according to Romish writers, never have any thing to do! Well, but let us hear the Archdeacon's account of the matter:—

"Kells," he says, "is set down at 1553*l.* as the income of the parish itself, without taking into account the income of the Archdeaconry, which is given separately in page 45. Now, the gross income, as given in the Third Report, page 186, is 1447*l.* 9*s.* 5*d.* From this Serjeant Shee professes to deduct one-fourth of the composition, or 295*l.* 4*s.* 3*d.* The figures he was bound to give were therefore 1152*l.* 5*s.* 2*d.*, instead of 1553*l.*

"Again, Serjeant Shee himself, in col. 1, gives the parish as divided into two, Kells and Balrathboyne; yet he sets down the income as undivided.

"The true figures for Kells should now be	£832	0	2
From which deduct proportion of money			
sunk on house at 10 per cent. . . .	£53	4	0
On money recoverable at 5 per cent. . .	65	13	0
Proportion of tax to Ecclesiastical Com-			
missioners	114	0	0
Poor rate and County rate, at 2 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> .	104	0	0
Visitation fees	4	0	0
	<hr/>		
		340	17 0

Actual income to the present Incumbent £491 3 2
without deducting curate's salary or schools. And this is the income which figures in Serjeant Shee's third column at 1553*l.*!

¹ Reply, &c., p. 17.

“ On the principles on which Serjeant Shee professes to calculate his surplus, viz., appropriating the income of each parish above 300*l.* in col. 3 of his tables (see p. 217 of his book), he must have reckoned on this parish of Kells for 1253*l.* of his surplus. Yet, if he really intended to leave the next incumbent 300*l.* per annum to live on, his surplus from it will be only 228*l.* 13*s.* 2*d.*, and of this he himself proposes to allow 75*l.* for a curate, reducing his available surplus to 153*l.* 13*s.* 2*d.*, instead of 1253*l.*; so here is 1099*l.* 6*s.* 10*d.* of his surplus gone, by examining the facts of one parish alone ².”

So much for Serjeant Shee, and his knowledge of the statistics of Irish clerical incomes. But we said that the learned Serjeant stood in great need of the services of an accountant, who might add up his figures for him. What says the Archdeacon on this point?

“ I have shown what the figures are worth which stand in the money column (column 3) in Serjeant Shee's Reports.

“ It can hardly be necessary now to examine the figures which stand at the foot of this column in each diocese, and represent its total, but it may be amusing to do so.

“ There are thirty-two of these columns, each totted up separately (exclusive of Newry exempt jurisdiction, in page 74). Would not any one expect that the figures at the foot of the money column were really the total amount of the money column, obtained by adding its several sums together? Yet in two only out of the thirty-two (and those very small in amount, viz., Clonfert, 3209*l.*; and Kilmacdaugh, 1638*l.*) do the figures at the foot give the actual amount of the column! and the difference often amounts to hundreds and thousands of pounds. This seems incredible; but I have got the accountant of a bank to go over the figures, and he agrees with me. . . . There is nothing in Serjeant Shee's book to account for this. Yet I thought it impossible but that some account could be given. I have tried every method I could think of, and none serves even to lessen the difficulty. I thought the suppression of some benefices might throw light on it; but how could that be, since he is as often over the mark as under it? And besides, he includes suppressed incomes, with exceptions so few as to make me think them accidental: and having obtained a list of suppressed benefices and their value, I find it does not solve the difficulty in any case. I tried evident misprints, and this failed in every case. I tried ministers' money, and it throws no light on it. I tried every conceivable deduction from clerical income, and failed in every case. Wilful misrepresentation is out of the question; for errors, often amounting to hundreds and thousands of pounds, are as frequent on the one side as on the other; and the balance on the whole is against the case which the book seeks to support.

“ After many days of intense labour, I was forced to the conclusion

² Reply, &c., pp. 19 20.

that if I had taken a handful of figures out of a bag and shaken them out on the table, and then set to work to investigate the principle on which they were arranged, I should have had as hopeful and as possible a task. There is no solution but the utter incapacity of the persons engaged in getting up this book of statistics. As far as one can judge from the book itself, there was not one person engaged in it, who was capable of totting up a column of figures, or who thought it worth his while to do so. In Kilfenora diocese (p. 186), there were but six lines to add up, and the amount is only £1317—a child three months at a parish school should do it, yet the error in the total is £131³."

May we not well say with the Archdeacon, "Ohe, jam satis est!" We assure our readers that the specimens of the book we have already given, are perfectly fair specimens. Supposing Archdeacon Stopford's "reply" to be correct, of which we entertain no doubt whatever, the book, from beginning to end, is full of such blunders as those to which we have alluded. Were we to prove this statement in detail, we should simply have to quote the whole of Archdeacon Stopford's "reply." Let us give only one more instance. Serjeant Shee quietly assures his readers, that archdeacons, and other clerical dignitaries, have "no duties to perform," because the predecessor of Archdeacon Stopford, in his answer to the question whether there were any, and what duties *annexed* to the office, answered, "there were no such duties;" supposing the question to refer, not to inherent duties, duties "which belong to the office of *common right*, and by the general law of the Church," but to duties "superadded by some local custom or accident."

"My predecessor," says Archdeacon Stopford, "fell into this natural mistake as to the meaning of the query, and answered that there were none such. But surely Serjeant Shee's legal knowledge might have told him that there were duties imposed by common right and positive law upon every archdeacon. I beg to tell him mine:—

"1. To examine solemnly, and to make diligent inquiry concerning, all candidates for Holy Orders; and to testify the result of this examination and inquiry at ordination. (See Ordination Service.)

"2. To examine persons presented to livings whenever directed by the bishop.

"3. To be the 'Oculus Episcopi;' to watch over the general condition of the diocese and every parish in it; and to report to the bishop whatever may require the bishop's interference.

"4. To attend confirmations and visitations; and to be ready at visitations with all information about every parish.

"5. To aid the bishop in the whole administration of the diocese, whenever and as required by him. Thus, during the illness of the late

³ Reply, &c., pp. 22—24.

bishop, I had to undertake the whole administration of the diocese for six months, without any additional pay or profit; and it was my bounden duty as archdeacon to undertake this when required; and when the bishop is resident, to take whatever part he directs, and to give whatever assistance he requires, in the administration of the diocese.

“6. To hold all inquiries the bishop may direct. Such occur pretty often.

“These are duties not annexed, but inherent in the office itself. Besides these, many duties not legally belonging to it do naturally attach to the situation; such as advice to the clergy in many matters in which they seek it; and considerable correspondence; and other duties which must needs be undertaken by persons in such situations, such as answering Serjeant Shee's book, and examining all its figures and calculations, and totting all its columns! Such duties sometimes keep me, as they do at present, at work for seventy-eight hours in the week.

“In this case Serjeant Shee had some excuse for saying ‘no duties to perform.’ But what can we say of his statement in the note which I have already quoted from page 216 of his book when he says, of *all* dignitaries, ‘none of them have any duties to perform.’ What! when he had whole columns of the returns before him, stating that archdeacons have duties to perform, when he had the same thing distinctly affirmed in the Second Report itself, page 11.

“Surely deans have their cathedrals to attend to, and archdeacons have all the proper duties of their office, and very few of them have any pay for it. Only twenty-one archdeacons have any income as such.

“Thirteen archdeacons have no income as such.

“These facts may explain why Serjeant Shee's book gives no tabular statement of the incomes of dignitaries.

“As for those who really have no duties, most have already been stripped of all their income by the laws now in force; and all will be dealt with as vacancies occur⁴.”

But we have exposed Serjeant Shee's blunders, we must now expose the gross injustice by which he proposes to provide his “surplus fund,” or rather, the Archdeacon shall expose it in his own peculiarly forcible manner.

“But Serjeant Shee's proposal for dealing with a supposed income in the hands of the Commissioners presents some points worthy of notice.

“The Act 3 & 4 Will. IV. c. 87, relieved the land from building and repairing churches, and paying clerks, sextons, &c.; and threw this whole burthen on a Church property which I have shown is too small, according to Serjeant Shee's ideas, for bishops and parochial clergy only. Of this Serjeant Shee says: ‘Truth to say, the abolition of parochial assessments for Church purposes, and the conversion of

⁴ Reply, &c.

tithe into rent-charge, have materially diminished the annoyance and burthen of the Establishment.'—(p. 213).

"He now finds that we are spending, through the Ecclesiastical Commission, a sum of 32,929*l.* 3*s.* out of our own incomes, to meet those charges from which landed property has been relieved. He fixes his eye upon this, and he says: 'Would it tend to the subversion of the Protestant Church Establishment, or disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government in the United Kingdom, if these requisites, &c. &c., were provided in every benefice at the cost of those who profit by their use? . . . If not, that sum might well form the nucleus of a fund to be devoted, with the sanction of Parliament, to the great object of promoting among all classes of Irishmen the blessings of conciliation and peace.'—(p. 215).

"Was ever 'stand and deliver,' said with a better grace? To satisfy Serjeant Shee's clients the burthen was thrown on the Clergy who minister in the churches; and now they say, 'Cannot you put it on the congregation, and hand us over that portion of the Clergy's income?'

"And suppose we take this further step, who will secure us from such a request as this hereafter: 'We find you still have money stirring for your churches, just please to conciliate us with that too?'

"I pass over some other proposals for raising a surplus out of imaginary income, and I come to one which is at least amusing. Page 218, he finds an item 'of 6436*l.* for salaries to Commissioners, Secretary, Treasurer, Clerks, &c.;' and he asks, 'Would it endanger the Protestant Church, or disturb or weaken the Protestant religion, &c. &c., if persons were selected to perform their duties at salaries less by one half than the amount hitherto taken credit for? If not, a further sum of 3200*l.* would, in a few years, be applicable to the purposes of conciliation and peace.'

"There is a beautiful simplicity in this method of raising a surplus, which is worthy of the notice of a Chancellor of the Exchequer in difficulties.

"Let us just imagine a conversation between such a Chancellor and Serjeant Shee.

"*Chancellor of the Exchequer.*—'My dear friend, what shall I do? There is a great deficiency in the Budget, and no possible means of supplying it.'

"*Serjeant Shee.*—'Oh! nothing can be simpler. Just take some public office, and divide by two.'

"*Chancellor of the Exchequer.*—'But suppose the business of the office should suffer by employing unsuitable men.'

"*Serjeant Shee.*—'Pooh! what do you care for that? I will stake my character as a lawyer that it is not contrary to the Oath of Allegiance. Just divide by two.'

"*Chancellor of the Exchequer.*—'But, my dear friend, when I am about it, why not divide by four? the saving would surely be greater.'

"*Serjeant Shee.*—'Oh! no, don't try that. Dividing by four is a

difficult and hazardous operation. I tried that often, in reducing tithe composition to rent-charge; and somehow I found that the sums *would* grow larger in the process,—so don't try that. But dividing by two is safe and easy, any one can do it.'

"Has it occurred to Serjeant Shee to inquire whether proper clerks could be got for a public office at one-half what the Commissioners now pay? Has it occurred to him to inquire for what the Treasurer is responsible, what security he must give, and what salary he gets?"

"The present income is about 80,000*l.* per annum, received and disbursed in very small sums, which must be separately stated; the Treasurer gives *bona fide* security on landed property for 60,000*l.* His salary is 500*l.* per annum. Serjeant Shee proposes that more than 100,000*l.* additional per annum should pass through the hands of this Treasurer (p. 219), and that his salary should be 250*l.* per annum. Will Serjeant Shee now apply to a Guarantee Society, and ask them what they would charge for security on the handling of such an income? or whether they would give any security for the Treasurer of such an income on such a salary? When he shall have got their answer, he will know what men of business will think of his off-hand proposals⁵."

In the 17th chapter, Archdeacon Stopford gives a very amusing reply to the assertion of Serjeant Shee, that the Irish Church is really the cause of all the difficulties of "unhappy Ireland." As the chapter is a short one, for the amusement of our readers, we will quote it entire:—

"As a matter of course, Serjeant Shee, in the first page of his book, states that the present Church Establishment 'is at the root of *all* the difficulties of the Queen's government in Ireland.' If all Ireland were subject to Dr. Mac Hale, the Queen, perhaps, would have no difficulty at all.

"It is useless to argue against such opinions. In every household there is some one to bear the blame of all mischief done. In most households it is 'the cat.' It is always 'the cat did it,' and very strange things are sometimes laid upon 'the cat.' We have just had an earthquake, and it is amusing to see in the newspapers how commonly the poor people who were roused up out of their beds did lay the blame upon 'the cat⁶.' Yet, as far as evidence goes, poor puss may be innocent. It cannot find that 'the cat' did really jump off the top of the press, or upset the wash-hand stand, or throw the house out of the windows.

⁵ Reply, &c, pp. 61—64.

⁶ "I at first thought the cat had leaped from the top of a press to the ground. On inquiring among my friends I found that this impression was very general."—*Saunders' News-Letter*.

"He was awake by a loud noise and a shaking of the house, which, however, he attributed to something heavy having been thrown down by the cat."—*Liverpool Standard*.

"I was awakened by a loud noise and a tremulous motion of the house. At first I thought it was occasioned by the cat."—*Times*, Nov. 10, p. 8.

"It is, however, useless to defend 'the cat' while who do mischief. But we may, at least, inquire what method of dealing with 'the cat' will stop mischief for

"Serjeant Shee would not kill the cat; he would cut some of the superfluous joints of the tail. Well, they have no tails. It might be worth inquiry whether 'the cat' is the chief there. The Establishment is better provided elsewhere, and the Queen's government gets on pretty well. Presbyterians are friendly to it; they have before them its support, and they may yet so do again when they regard it as a bulwark of civil and religious liberty. They would safely be surrendered to Rome.

"In many parts of the south and west the Establishment could hardly be said to exist. For instance, the Union in Galway, containing ten parishes, and stated by the Public Instruction to be fifty miles in length, has had 270 $\frac{1}{2}$. Yet those parts have not been free from Irishism. Serjeant Shee hopes for a remedy in abstracting superfluous legs. If true, he calculates proportions so ill, that we fear he will cut the cat's legs too. And some may applaud his scheme, thinking it quite easy to catch and kill her at pleasure. However, Serjeant Shee has sworn not to kill the cat, and he respects his oath. He really believes in the efficacy of what he proposes. Serjeant Shee answers this himself: 'It were too much to presume that the reforms suggested in the preceding chapters, in their nature and extent, satisfy the requirements of the part of his co-religionists.'—(p. 224).

"Would Serjeant Shee recommend a client to come to such promise of peace as he offers us here? When the Church shall be brought forward in the House of Commons, the author of all mischief in Ireland, I hope some one will say, 'cat did it!'"

In the next chapter the Archdeacon supplies material for ascertaining which of the two churches existing in Ireland, is a schismatic Church. He

"In page 5, Serjeant Shee says, 'But for the zealousness of the Pope, of whom, at the time of James I., there was one in every diocese, the people would have without any observance of public worship.' This gained some importance from the recent discussions on the occasion of the Irish Roman Bishops had been preservation.

"Serjeant Shee refers to the case of *præmunire* in the Reports. The words in that case are, 'For almost in this kingdom there is a titular Bishop ordained by

jeant Shee, in the passage above quoted, leaves out 'almost,' and quotes it as proving that 'there was one in *every* diocese;' and that, though the case itself happens accidentally to prove beyond all question, that in these dioceses at the time of this case, and as the case itself says, for 'many years together,' there was no such Bishop. For the very thing for which Lalor was brought to trial was for acting as 'Vicar-General of the *See Apostolic*, within the Archbishopric of Dublin and the Bishoprics of Kildare and Ferns,' and this delegated authority from the Pope himself is conclusive that there was not any Bishop in those Sees acknowledged by the Pope.

"I will presently show the importance of this fact, in the light which it throws on the appointments made by the Pope.

"Serjeant Shee knows that statements made by counsel are not proof unless supported by evidence; and those who will consider the following evidence may agree with me in thinking, that the 'almost' in the above statement must be taken in a pretty wide extent.

"In the *Historia Catholica* of Philip O'Sullivan Beare, written in 1619-20, and published by him in 1621, I find the following, p. 297:—

"'. . . . In memoriam revocandum est, in Ibernia Archiepiscopatus quatuor, et episcopatus complures esse, *omnisque hodie ab hæresiarchis possideri*: ob idque titulis eorum Catholicos præsulis *nomini raro creari*, quod sine vectigalibus ecclesiasticis tanta episcoporum turba dignitatum et honorum tueri non posse videatur. Quamobrem Archiepiscopi quatuor qui sunt a Romano Pontifice inaugurati, in suffraganeis Episcopatibus Vicarios generales constituunt, auctoritate apostolica accedente'

"I shall show presently that this must be taken with some limitation even as to the four Archbishops; but it is a clear confession, that no succession was kept up in the other Sees. And this confession comes eighty-four years after the rejection of the Pope's supremacy under Henry VIII., and sixty years after the Reformation under Elizabeth*."

In his last two chapters, the Archdeacon enters very fully and conclusively into the questions of the "title to Irish Church property," and of the "union of the Churches of England and Ireland:—

"It may be fitting," he says, "in conclusion, to notice briefly the title to Irish Church property. Serjeant Shee does not allude to this subject, and his associates at the Religious Conference Meeting were evidently anxious to evade it; but silence on this subject is worthy of notice. For *one* has spoken on it publicly who knows what lies beneath. 'Those ecclesiastical funds, long misused, should, after the life interests of their present occupants, revert to their own original purposes of promoting Catholic piety, charity, and education. . . .

* Reply, &c.

It is fortunate that there remains such a fund for the erection and endowment of Catholic schools, and the building of Catholic churches, and, *should it extend so far*, to serve as an outfit for the purchase of Catholic glebes. It will be an act of just and tardy *restitution* of property, long diverted from its legitimate objects.'

"But this did not suit the politics of the 'Conference for Religious Equality,' and accordingly we find an editorial article in the next 'Tablet,' October 2, labouring to explain it away. Speaking of the above passage, the only passage on the subject in that letter, the writer in the 'Tablet' says: 'We apprehend his Grace's letter has been mistaken in one respect. We do not understand him to have urged the endowment of the Catholic Church in Ireland in lieu of the endowment of the Protestant Church, or the substitution of one establishment for another; but to have contemplated a *redistribution* of a national fund impartially *among all classes and religions, &c.*' Let any one who can put this construction on the above words of Dr. Mac Hale; it will not be harder to get rid of hereafter than the evidence so often given, and the oaths so often sworn, that Roman Catholics have no intention to subvert the Church Establishment.

"But however such intention of redistribution may be professed in public, *restitution* is the notion among themselves. Not long since a sermon, which was duly reported, was preached in the Chapel of Kells, on the subject of restitution, and the application of the sermon lay in this, that it was impossible that I could enter the kingdom of heaven unless I made restitution of the archdeaconry of Meath to the rightful owners. The present evasion of this claim in public, is, therefore, no reason why we should lose sight of it: I therefore consider briefly the rightful title to Church property in Ireland."

He then ably shows that the Church is a body corporate, with capacity to hold property; that all laws, both of the Church and the State, place the succession of the Church in the succession of the clergy; that "they who abandon the succession of the clergy lawfully continued, are not the body corporate; they who adhere to it are;" and that, therefore, the only real question is, "what bishops in Ireland are now the legitimate successors of the Irish bishops before the Reformation?" a point we have already fully considered in our notice of Dr. Wordsworth's Sermons.

But it may be said, "granting that you prove the *succession* of your bishops, still that succession was '*not lawfully continued*,' because they were not in communion with the Romish See, and, therefore, could not lawfully claim the property of the ante-Reformation Church." Archdeacon Stopford shall answer the objection:—

“ But if he maintain,” he says, “ that submission to the Papal jurisdiction is necessary to the existence of a Church, we meet him on this too, from the law and practice of the Catholic Church from the beginning.

“ And not only upon that, but upon the law of this land in every age, before the Reformation as well as since. Let him read the Irish Acts, 7 Edw. IV. c. 2 and 3, and 10 Henry VIII. c. 5. It was under these Acts that the Church held property in Ireland before the Reformation. Does Dr. MacHale really mean to accept those Acts,—the Statutes of Provisors and *Præmunire*,—when he claims the ‘ restitution ’ of Church property—‘ all as free and independent of any sinister interference of the secular power as when first abstracted from those pious uses ? ’ Dr. MacHale was certainly on dangerous ground when he claimed this restitution under the former title.

“ Those Acts are demonstrative that, by the law of this country, the Church, before she was reformed, held property in Ireland, not by virtue of her submission to Roman jurisdiction, but notwithstanding it. And on the laws of the land, before the Reformation, we are ready to meet the real claim of Rome whenever she may venture to put it forward ; for it is in fact nothing else than this—that although a body corporate has existed in this country from time immemorial, and still exists, acknowledged by the State as capable of holding property, and still actually holding it in perpetual succession,—yet the Pope, having withdrawn his countenance from this body corporate, and having constituted a new one by his own authority, he has power to transfer the property to his creation, and the law of the land cannot resist him. This is the claim ; when probed to the bottom, and dragged into light, it will be found to rest solely on the Papal supremacy as having a right superior to the law, of disposing of Church property in this country.

“ But it is not convenient to put this forward ; and hence we may understand why Serjeant Shee commences his history with Edward VI. and Elizabeth, leaving unmentioned all that was done under Henry VIII. No Roman doctrine was therein removed ; but it is notorious that, from the year 1542, the whole Irish Church was unanimous in rejecting the Papal supremacy and the Council of Trent. Will any one tell me who then stood up for it ? Well, then, did the Irish Church then forfeit her title to Church property ? It would be very awkward to answer *yes*, for that would amount to a premature confession of the title now set up against us ; it would be still more awkward to answer *no*, for then the Reformed Church has never lost her title by renouncing the Papal supremacy. So Serjeant Shee omitted all this, and plunged in *medias res* in the time of Queen Elizabeth¹.”

So much for the justice of the case. But the Archdeacon goes into the facts in detail :—

¹ Reply, &c.

"If ever," he says, "there were any Church property in Ireland to which Rome could show an original title, it was the monasteries of the modern foundation, i. e. from the thirteenth century forward, when the supremacy of Rome had established itself. But this is exactly the property which the Irish Church does not possess. The reason of this is evident, on considering the difference of the earlier and later monastic systems. From the sixth to the tenth century, the Abbot of an Irish monastery was ever the Bishop of the diocese; a diocese at first without definite boundaries, enlarging as it gained upon the heathen, till it became bounded by meeting with another. The monastery was, in fact, the Bishop and his Clergy, living in common, according to the original system in every missionary Church; and the monastery was also the missionary school. As the parochial system gained ground, the Abbot gradually changed into the modern diocesan Bishop, and the property of the monastery became the property of the See. But the modern monasteries never had any connexion with the Bishop or the diocese. Hence the Bishops, at the Reformation, retained the property of the old Irish monasteries, while the property of the later ones was confiscated and passed away from the Church. They who would now seek restitution of the only property that Rome could ever claim in Ireland on her own right, must look elsewhere than to the Church for it.

"So far from gaining by those later monasteries, it would be well for us now if the Irish Church had not lost heavily by them. For those monasteries by degrees engrossed the tithes and glebes of all the parishes around them; and these, too, went in the general confiscation. This was the great cause of the failure of the Reformation in Ireland. Hundreds of parishes were every where left without a ministry, a prey to the emissaries of Rome and of rebellion. This short-sighted policy was the ruin of the country, both politically and religiously. Serjeant Shee himself has given us an instance: 'In vain did Sir Henry Sidney the Lord Deputy, represent to her Majesty . . . that it might please her, as a most virtuous Queen, to give warrant that some convenient portion of the revenue of every parsonage be bestowed on the minister and church of the same'—(p. 4). And all this was confirmed by 3 & 4 Phil. and Mary, c. 8. We feel the effect of this neglect to this day. In every district occupied by the later monasteries, there was, for a long period, no provision for a reformed ministry; there is yet a very poor provision for one; and such districts are to this day most subject to Rome. Hence the richest and most fertile districts where monasteries were usually settled, such as the valley of the Boyne and the rich lands adjoining, are the least reformed, while poor districts in the same county are the most reformed.

"But however we may have suffered by this, we are at least able to say, that no property to which the Church of Rome could show an original title has passed into the hands of the Church at the Reformation²."

² Reply, &c.

With regard to the "Union of the Churches of England and Ireland," the Archdeacon proves the fallacy of the assertion, that that union dates from A.D. 1800. He shows that it dates from the Synod of Cashel, in 1172; that it was recognized at the General Council of Constance in 1414, where the "Anglican Church" was represented on all committees and judicial tribunals by "Patrick, Bishop of Cork," and was again recognized by the temporal and spiritual power, both in England and Ireland, at the time of the Reformation; that, although an attempt was made in 1615 to introduce a separate set of Articles, yet that attempt was never legally sanctioned; and that, in 1634, the English Articles were formally adopted by the Irish Convocation. And then the Archdeacon thus concludes:—

"Is it possible now to trace the origin of 'the Church of England and Ireland' to the Act of 1800? Can that Act be any thing more than a solemn recognition and pledge to maintain a union existing for centuries before?"

"Our enemies will seek to separate us; let us learn to maintain our ancient union. That union, at its commencement, brought Ireland under foreign subjugation. Let it not be now disclaimed to perpetuate the evil³."

And here for the present we take our leave of Archdeacon Stopford, tendering him our very best thanks for the triumphant manner in which he has, at such very great personal labour, exposed the gross blunders, and the unjust deductions from those blunders, of Serjeant Shee. We only trust that, if ever the Irish Church be exposed to a similar attack, she may be fortunate enough to meet with so zealous and able a defender as the Archdeacon of Meath.

But there is a further reason, wholly independent of any we have yet given, why we think Serjeant Shee will find it very difficult to persuade the British Parliament to appropriate to the use of the Romish priesthood the property of the Catholic Church. We would suggest to Serjeant Shee, that it is scarcely a time, when Ireland is quietly, but not the less surely, slipping from the grasp of the Church to which he belongs—when thousands and tens of thousands are leaving the faith to which they have heretofore, as we used to be constantly told, clung with such unshaken steadfastness, such unparalleled devotion—when thousands and tens of thousands more are only detained within the pale of the Romish Church, because of the brutal violence, and the ruffianly persecution to which, if they followed the dictates of their own consciences, they would inevitably be subjected—violence and perse-

³ Reply, &c.

cution, moreover, of which the Irish priesthood are, beyond all doubt, speaking generally, the immediate instigators, and, not unfrequently, the active abettors—it is, we say, scarcely a time gravely to ask the British Parliament to endow schism, and violence, and sedition, at the expense of that very Church, within whose sheltering arms such vast numbers of Irish Romanists are daily taking refuge. What would Serjeant Shee think of that man's sanity, let alone his common sense, who, when by a reform in our legal system, men are enabled to bring their suits before a tribunal at a fiftieth part of the time, and cost, and labour, and anxiety heretofore required, should gravely propose not to simplify, but to render tenfold more intricate the details of a suit at law—not to lessen, but to increase the multiplied and vexatious technicalities of the old established system? And, yet, what but this does the learned Serjeant now propose to do? Ireland is gradually casting off the trammels of the Romish Church, and this is the time, of all others, when he gravely proposes to endow that Church on a scale of unprecedented magnitude, and that from the property of the very Communion through whose exertions Rome is receiving her death-blow! Archdeacon Stopford thus forcibly alludes to the subject of the movement now in progress:—

“I have now to consider the figures in Serjeant Shee's columns 8, 9, 10, which give the numbers of the different religious denominations in the several parishes. Serjeant Shee takes these figures from the Report of the ‘Commission of Public Instruction’ appointed in 1834 to ascertain these numbers. We can hardly expect to find that his figures have been taken correctly. Each page that I have examined presents numerous and important errors. But there are greater objections to Serjeant Shee's use of these figures than such inaccuracies as these. Serjeant Shee proposes to legislate for parishes individually, on the presumption that these figures show the present proportion of the different religious denominations in each parish;—whereas every one acquainted with the history of Ireland for the last six years knows that that Report of the Commission of Public Instruction has been rendered mere matter of history, as much as if a century or two centuries of ordinary times had elapsed since it was made.

“If any one should now propose a scheme for the future government of Australia, in which each minute subdivision was to be dealt with for the future on the assumption that a statement of its population two years ago afforded grounds for legislation, every one would exclaim that you might as well legislate for Australia as it was a century ago.

“Ireland has in the last six years passed through ‘a famine of the middle ages falling on a population of the nineteenth century.’ Perhaps a million of her inhabitants have since crossed the ocean, and the tide is rising as it flows. And she has entered on a movement of

religious opinion which promises to rival the sixteenth century. Tens of thousands of Roman Catholics, in the face of an organized intimidation to which that century hardly affords a parallel,—an intimidation which threatens the life of converts, and the daily subsistence of themselves and their children,—have openly cast off the religion of Rome, and are now among the most earnest and attentive members of the Church of England and Ireland.

“Those who have faced dangers so terrible to the Irish peasant are but the proof of the religious opinions of still greater numbers, whose hearts yet fail them. There is around the converts a mixed multitude who would fain go up with Israel, but the passage of the stormy sea before them, the baptism they have to be baptized with, the howling wilderness beyond,—all these make their hearts yet to faint, and keep them still in the bondage from which they would fain be free. And no wonder that they faint: I write of that which I do daily witness. Men paid for ringing handbells through the streets to raise a mob of all ‘lewd fellows of the baser sort,’ to hunt the Scripture readers, and to beset the house of every one who dares to entertain them; readers stoned by infuriated mobs, and daily covered with mud and filth; and when the law stops actual assault, hunted, at every moment they appear, by crowds of street boys furnished with whistles, bird-calls, cat-calls, specially imported for the purpose by the organizers of the system; and as these boys start off in pursuit at the sight of their game, they are heard to exclaim to one another, ‘Come, boys, let us earn the halfpenny;’ the passions of the people excited to the highest pitch by sermons from the altar, by ribald ballads distributed by basketsful in the chapels, and handed out of the windows of the priest’s house; and by addresses by priests from the same windows to the lowest mobs, containing such sentiments as these: ‘There will never be peace nor quiet in Ireland till the day that’s coming, when Napoleon the Third shall land in England with his imperial diadem upon his head.’

“With what danger such addresses are fraught to converts we have witness. Almost while I write, two Roman Catholic strangers, who worshipped in the chapel, were seized upon in the middle of the priest’s address, by an infuriated mob, upon the mere suspicion (quite unfounded, so far as I can learn) of their being converts, and under the very roof with the priest, were hurled down the gallery stairs, and with difficulty escaped with their lives.

“And this in a town in which, until the system of terror was organized in the usual mode, the readers had free access to the houses and were kindly entertained; where they would still be freely received by many, if their courage was equal to their will.

“I do not write as surprised at these things, or as complaining of them. The experience of a multitude of different localities has taught us to face them with a confidence of success. For where the people are forced to see that in no other way can their religion be defended against the only weapon which is used against it—the Douay Bible—they become the more anxious to inquire. I only advert to

these things here, that it may be borne in mind that the following results have appeared notwithstanding a great falling off in the number of population, and, in perhaps every instance, in defiance of such an organized system of terror as I have described⁴."

The Archdeacon then shows the wonderful increase in the number of Protestants, and thus proceeds:—

"Have we not unquestionable proof from other sources of the real disposition of the people? Is it not a matter of notoriety that, of Irish Roman Catholics who have gone to America in late years, not one in four has continued a Roman Catholic there. I learned, on good authority, three years ago, that this very statement had been made by a professor of Maynooth College. In April of this year a letter has been published in the *Tablet*, *Freeman's Journal*, &c., written by Mr. Mullin, R. C. Curate of Clonmellon, who was sent out as a deputation by the Roman Bishops in Ireland to collect funds for their new University. This gentleman publishes the result of his inquiries about Irish Romanists in America since the year 1825. His result is as follows:—'Number lost to the Catholic Church, 1,990,000. Say, in round numbers, TWO MILLIONS.'

"Is it wholly inconceivable, that the Irish Romanists should entertain any similar disposition in their own country? Is there any difference so great in the two positions as this, that a system of terror is in operation in Ireland from which in America they are free?

"Did the writer of Serjeant Shee's book know nothing of all this? Ay did he. In page 38, after stating the episcopal patronage of an Irish diocese (upon his own exaggerated figures), he observes: 'The stimulus which this gives to the proselytizing zeal of the incumbents of the smaller livings, and of ill-paid curates in dioceses of which the Bishop who has a proselytizing turn, can hardly be imagined by those who have not lived in Ireland.' So the writer of this book did live in Ireland, and not in London, during the last five years; and yet he has mistaken his facts. The movement among the Irish Clergy is as great as among the Irish people. It is not the incumbents of the small livings only, nor the ill-paid curates only, that feel their heart stirred within them. Professional advancement is not the only motive that can influence the Irish clergyman. It surely is possible that those who have found God's Word and promises precious to their own souls may have a real zeal, from that motive only, to make it known to others. And if the writer who lives in Ireland would look about him, he might see this zeal displayed not only by ill-paid curates, but by those whose station, character, and abilities might well entitle them to notice, if they avoided this work; but whose worldly prospects can hardly be advanced, by raising up against themselves that storm of obloquy and hostility which they have to encounter in this cause.

"But the writer's cognizance of these facts (such as it is) throws a

⁴ Reply, &c., pp. 70—72.

new light upon his book. His scheme is to reduce all livings to a low level. In furtherance of this plan, he here points out the stimulus which *he thinks* the inequality of livings has given to proselytizing zeal—pointing out a means to an end. Persuaded as I am that his reasoning is wholly wrong,—knowing, as I well do, that those who have been the longest and most earnest labourers in this work, have never engaged in it as a means towards professional advancement,—I yet see in this statement an object of this book. And this directs me to its concluding paragraph:—‘A scheme of Irish Church Reform, to be proposed by Catholics to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, should be free from all suspicion of a design to subvert the Church Establishment, or weaken, *in its legitimate range of action*, the influence of the Protestant religion.’

“This is in pursuance of the oath, ‘I will never exercise any privilege, to which I am or may become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion;’ but the oath contains no qualification about ‘its legitimate range of action.’ What is the meaning of these words, or the object of introducing them? Is it not revealed in the note I have quoted about the stimulus which the Bishop’s patronage gives to proselytizing zeal?

“If it were a practical question between me and Serjeant Shee, I might ask him to consider whether ‘its legitimate range of action,’ in the sense of that legal oath which he has taken, must not be interpreted by the legal object and purpose of the Establishment itself. His book has often declared that the legal purpose of the Establishment itself is to bring the Irish people to conform to it. And can law or morality justify the insertion of qualifications which the oath itself does not contain, to construe that oath so as to leave men at liberty to defeat that very purpose?

“But this is no practical question between us; for I have already shown that the property now enjoyed by the Irish Church is not sufficient for that which Serjeant Shee himself considers the necessary requirements for its legitimate range of action. I therefore gladly leave this part of the subject; and the more so as the degree of respect which Serjeant Shee does pay to his oath, contrasting as it does so favourably with the conduct of his allies, and the decrees of his Church, commands my respect and esteem’.”

Does Serjeant Shee doubt the truth of the reports which are circulated respecting the progress of this NEW REFORMATION, this new “restoration to Catholic orthodoxy?” We will give him a few details from a little work, whose express object it is to circulate authentic information respecting the results of that excellent Society, the “Irish Church Missions:”—

“One whole district,” we are told, “has been worked upon the principles of the Irish Church Missions, as an experimental effort.

This has been attended with rapid success. From the vantage-ground of this manifested result, efforts to carry out the same principles are now to be made in every part of the country. The faith of the Committee, borne upon the wings of their past experience, takes a high flight into the heaven of hope; and believing that what God has already blessed with the tokens of His favour, may be confidently carried on with the expectation of the same blessing, the Committee are acting with no faint hope that the means which have been brought into the treasury, beyond the measure of their early anticipations, will be still poured forth, in due proportion with the requirement of the work. Twenty Missions are in actual operation; two more are immediately commencing; and two are so arranged, that it is hoped they may be opened in a short time.

“These twenty-four Missions having been arranged, it has been the subject of much prayerful consideration how this machinery shall be brought to bear most effectually upon the strongholds of Romanism in Ireland. It has been decided, that a combined and systematic effort should be made, in every part of the Missions simultaneously, at the very period that our present number will come into the hands of our readers. The month of November has been employed in final and practical arrangements for this purpose, even as the previous months of August, September, and October were occupied in personal inspection of the Missions, and conference with the Missionaries upon the subject.”

And it is most satisfactory to notice the manner in which the “Irish Church Missions Society” conducts its operations. It is plain that their object is not merely to destroy, but to build up also—not merely to persuade Irish Romanists to forsake the tyranny, and to renounce the corrupt teaching of the Church of Rome, but, in so doing, to embrace the pure and scriptural faith of the “United Church of England and Ireland.” They are working with the full approbation and the cordial concurrence of the Bishops of the Irish Church. The work we are quoting thus speaks on this point:—

“Many things have concurred to encourage the Committee in determining upon the course to be pursued in the Missions, of which some explanation is given in the preceding article. Amongst the foremost of these encouraging marks of progress, has been the approbation expressed in various degrees by the Right Reverend the Bishops of Ireland. The principles of the Society for Irish Church Missions have gradually developed themselves in practice; and those whose peculiar duty it is to watch over the interests of the Church, would have been scarcely attentive to that duty, had they hastily adopted a system which circumstances called into action in an unusual manner. It is a legitimate source of gratification to the Committee, that exactly in pro-

⁶ *Banner of the Truth in Ireland*, pp. 147, 148.

portion to the extent of the operations of the Society in any diocese in Ireland, has been the approbation of the Bishop, after wise and careful delay for observation of the course pursued. This has been the effect, both amongst the Bishops and the Clergy; and the result is, that at the present moment, the feeling amongst the Clergy may be characterized as a general anxiety to co-operate with, and be assisted by, the Society, while every Bishop in Ireland, in whose diocese the Missions are at work, has sanctioned them with more or less of cordiality, as there has been more or less opportunity for experience. Upon the occasion of the report recently made to the Committee by the Hon. Secs., the following was recorded on the Minutes, and we are permitted to insert it here, as affording a detailed summary of the general statement we have now made.

“ Copy of Minute 1052 of the Committee of the Society for Irish Church Missions to the Roman Catholics.

“ ‘ MINUTE 1052 :—

“ ‘ The Honorary Secretary for Missions reported, that the present position of the Society in Ireland enabled him to state to the Committee, that there are upwards of 400 pulpits where the controversial teaching of the Society is carried on from time to time, and that the following will show the position of the Society with reference to the Right Rev. the Bishops.

“ ‘ The Society has Missions in the diocese of Armagh, &c., with the sanction of the Lord Primate.

“ ‘ A Mission has just been commenced in the diocese of the Archbishop of Dublin, to which his Grace states he has no objection.

“ ‘ A Mission has been commenced in the diocese of Meath, under Episcopal sanction; and the Bishop, appointed within these few days to the See, is an earnest friend of the Society.

“ ‘ The Bishop of Cashel has long been a Vice-President of the Society, and has ordained several of its Missionaries to work in his diocese.

“ ‘ The Bishop of Down recently presided at a meeting of the Society in Belfast, and publicly expressed his hearty approbation of its operations.

“ ‘ The Bishop of Kilmore is a liberal annual subscriber to the funds of the Society, and has cordially welcomed its operations into his diocese.

“ ‘ The Bishop of Killaloe has given his sanction to the Society’s Missionaries, and stated his cordial approbation.

“ ‘ The Bishop of Limerick has expressed to our Missionary, in his diocese, his good wishes for the success of the object in view.

“ ‘ The Bishop of Ossory has important Missions established in his diocese, to which he gives his cordial sanction.

“ ‘ The Bishop of Tuam has been the warm friend raised up of God to foster the Society’s efforts, and to direct the results of its greatest successes.

“ ‘ The Bishop of Cork is the only Bishop in Ireland within whose diocese the Society has not yet had any occasion to commence its operations, and there is no reason to suppose that his Lordship would differ from the whole of his Right Rev. Brethren, should circumstances bring the Society within his Episcopal charge’ .’ ”

We trust that this statement will satisfy the minds of those persons in the English Church who have hitherto looked with, possibly, not an unnatural degree of suspicion on the operations of the Society in question. There can be no doubt that as England has been greatly to blame, in past years, for her conduct towards Ireland and the Irish Church, so this Society opens up one very admirable means of repairing that neglect, by co-operation *with* the Irish Church, in the great work of diffusing throughout “unhappy Ireland” the blessings of civilization and the doctrines of a pure faith.

⁷ Banner of the Truth in Ireland, pp. 149, 150.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS, ETC.

1. Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington. 2. The Penny Post. 3. Reuben Medlicott; or, the Coming Man. 4. The Hero's Funeral. A Poem. 5. The History of Europe from the Fall of Napoleon in 1815 to the Accession of Louis Napoleon in 1852. 6. The Colloquies of Edward Osborne, Citizen and Clothworker of London. 7. The Church in the Apostolic Age. 8. Gilbert's Clergyman's Almanack, and Churchman's Miscellany for 1853. 9. A Complete Greek and English Lexicon for the Poems of Homer, &c. 10. The Pentateuch and its Assailants. A Refutation, &c. 11. A Short Explanation of the Epistles and Gospels of the Christian Year. 12. The Convocations of the Two Provinces; their Origin, Constitution, &c. 13. Parochial Sermons, preached in a Village Church. 14. The Fall of Man; from Milton's Paradise Lost. 15. A Letter to the Earl of Shaftesbury on the Establishment of Ragged School Churches. 16. Sermons. Second Series. Preached at Rome during the Seasons of 1850-51 and 1851-52. 17. The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles the Fifth. 18. A Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion. 19. Handbook to Convocation. 20. The Life of James Bonnell. 21. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. 22. A Church Dictionary. 23. The Rule of the Church a Law to all her Members, &c. 24. The Greek Testament, with a Critically revised Text, &c. 25. Confession and Absolution. A Letter to the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, &c. 26. The Dramatic Works of Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd, &c. 27. Vacation Rambles, in 1841, 1842, and 1843. 28. Romanism an Apostate Church. 29. A First History of Greece. 30. Sermons to Children, &c. 31. Holy Baptism, Confirmation, &c. &c. 32. The Ten Commandments. The Lord's Supper. Tracts for Penitents. 33. Thoughts in Past Years. 34. La Filosofia delle Scuole Italiane. Miscellaneous.
-

I.—*Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington.* By ALFRED TENNYSON, *Poet Laureate*. London: Edward Moxon, Dover Street. 1852.

THAT men may know beforehand, or rather feel instinctively, what any new poem of Tennyson's on any given subject will be, is not to be questioned, but this does not prevent his being a most delightful poet. Tennyson is emphatically *the* poet of the Age: he does not soar above it or beyond it in any respect, and *therefore* he is the more congenial to its feelings: he interprets the prose of his fellow-men into emphatic and high-sounding verse: he gives them back their own secret conceptions and prepossessions under a beautiful and ideal aspect: he catches up the tones of modern life, and transmutes them into magic melody. He *teaches* little; at the utmost he can only be said to suggest half-truths; but for an age which has lost the spirit of faith in no small measure, such suggestions have a greater claim than any bold assertions could have; and even we, who *possess* an infinitely higher truth as Christians and as Churchmen than the ideal which the poet of the nineteenth century so vaguely bodes forth, confess the theme of his melodious and mysterious lyre, and feel our hearts thrill to the accents of that doubtful, hopeful, wavering voice. Mr. Tennyson, it is

to be feared, would be "all things to all men:" for the Christian, he speaks thus of our adorable Redeemer,—

"Thou seemest human and divine,
The highest, holiest manhood Thou ;"

whilst to gratify the transcendental deist or pantheist, Carlyleite or Emersonian, he can tell of

"The Christ that is to be :"

a phrase, that it is possible perhaps to interpret of Millennial glory ; but which is, at all events, capable of the very worst construction, and is sure to have that construction put on it by very many readers. In fact, to quote the dictum of a former article in this "Review," above referred to, Tennyson "personifies, and expresses, and transfers to his poetical canvas the highly-educated gentleman of the nineteenth century : there is a certain nameless grace, a refined but painfully conscious elegance, a *savoir faire* and a *savoir vivre*, a little philosophy, not very deep though often affecting depth, a little Christianity not of a strict or practical character, a little infidelity, and a good deal of scepticism." In these charges we think there is great truth, though perhaps they are pressed a little too far ; but, after all, it is no mean praise to say of any man that he is emphatically *the* poet of his age. This does not indeed constitute the highest eminence ; but his must be a subtle and a lofty genius that can attain thereto. And be it remembered that Tennyson represents many of the best as well as some of the evil phases of the educated mind of his day ; love for man as man, and all the pure domestic affections are exquisitely illustrated in his many minor poems, which after all are unquestionably the greatest and highest of his compositions, though "The Princess" be very graceful, and "In Memoriam" fraught with much grace and melancholy beauty. Who that has read "The May Queen," and "The Lord of Burleigh," and "Lady Clare," and "Ellen Adare," and "The Gardener's Daughter," can help loving Tennyson ? Who that has studied "The Vision of Sin," can avoid reverencing the grandeur and wonderful power of his conceptions ? But to come at once to the Ode before us, it is, in our judgment, a most masterly composition, certainly intensely Tennysonian, marred perhaps by many mannerisms, which yet we should scarcely wish away, but on the whole sublime in its conception, and great in its execution also. We like least the opening, which is abrupt,

"Let us bury the Great Duke,
With an empire's lamentation ;"

but even this gains upon us, as Tennyson's verses are almost always sure to do; and whatever may be thought of this, the grandeur of the second, third, and fourth strophes must be admitted, we should say, by all. The second consists only of four rather peculiar, and eminently characteristic lines, in which a simple but fine idea is powerfully embodied:

“Where shall we lay the man whom we deplore?
Let the sound of those he wrought for,
And the feet of those he fought for,
Echo round his bones for evermore.”

Truly a fitting resting-place has England's great defender found in the heart of her central mart of commerce, where busy tens of thousands, reaping the fruits of his wisdom and valour, (for he was the chief instrument in God's hands for our deliverance,) daily pass the threshold of his great sepulchre. The third section is calmly magnificent, in its pure unstudied simplicity: (apparently unstudied: what matters it to us, whether the poet spent two minutes or two weeks, composing it?)

“Lead out the pageant: sad and slow,
As fits an universal woe,
Let the long, long procession go,
And let the sorrowing crowd about it grow,
And let the mournful martial trumpets blow;
The last great Englishman is low.”

Let us hope that the assertion of the last line will not be verified by future events. Indeed, when we first read this Ode,—it was late at night, and we were retiring to our rest—the “*cacoethes scribendi*” possessed us, or rather let us hope the Muse inspired us, with this bold reply,—

The last great Englishman laid low!
And is it so?
Friends and brothers, Queen and People,
Dare we not answer, No?
Lives not in us the heart to bear Fate's ominous blow,
And face the gathering Woe?
For like the avalanche, that lies in spell-bound rest
But at a touch might overwhelm some valley blest,
The Storm on high sits darkening; fitful breezes wake;—
Yet lives there Briton would his part forsake?
Our hearts are true, our souls are sound,
Liberty yet on earth is found,
Truth on her Island throne sits crown'd,
And viewless walls are rear'd by Heav'n Britannia's shores
around.”

But to return from our own hasty rhymes, thrown off at that witching hour of night, to the poet-laureate's masterly and elaborate composition, we have not space to devote to the considerations of all its many beauties : we cannot dwell on the grand but quaint fourth strophe,

" Render thanks to the Giver,
England, for thy Son,"

with its short, pregnant, powerful verses and volleying rhymes, which seem the echoes of a cannonade. Then comes the magnificent eulogy of Nelson ; then a noble celebration of England's civic greatness ; then (in strophe 8) another powerful vindication of Wellington's true fame and a devotional and solemn close, like the gradual dying away of some sublime strain of sacred music in a lofty fane. We will content ourselves with one more extract which will supersede the necessity for any efforts on our part to do justice to the great departed in our tame prose. Whose heart will not echo to this noble strain ?

" Of heads, our chief state-oracle is mute :
Mourn for the man of long enduring blood,
The statesman—warrior, moderate, resolute,
Whole in himself, a common good.
Mourn for the man of largest influence,
Yet freest from ambitious crime ;
Our greatest yet with least pretence,
Great in council and great in war,
The foremost captain of his time,
Rich in saving common sense,
And, as the greatest only are,
In his simplicity sublime.—
O good gray head which all men knew,
O voice from which their omens all men drew,
O iron nerve to true occasion true,
O fall'n at length that tower of strength
Which stood four-square to all the winds that blew !
Such was he, whom we deplore.
The long self-sacrifice of life is o'er :
The great world-victor's Victor will be seen no more."

There is a magnificence and a sobriety blended in this eulogium, most admirably characteristic of the hero whom it sings ; and the same praise will apply to the whole Ode. Despite some mannerism and, perhaps, some affectation, there are power and beauty, grandeur of sentiment and felicity of expression, sound and sense, combined in this noble composition, which has been received far too coldly by the public, and with the most preposterous affectation of patronage by many sensible critics of the day.

All honour to England's laureate, say *we*, who has amply justified the choice of England's Queen !

II.—*The Penny Post*. London: John Henry Parker, 377, Strand.

VERY happy are we to be able to state that there is a manifest improvement in the tone and spirit of this periodical. Our contemporary has now spoken out decidedly with regard to the Church of Rome and to mediæval fictions, and we can only exhort its editor to persevere in the same courageous course, not suffering himself to be deterred from a line of duty which is essential to gain the confidence of English Churchmen, rich or poor, either from motives of what we cannot but call mistaken and morbid delicacy, or from the vain desire to please and satisfy those who are already Rome's in heart. The tale of "Maria" has been touchingly concluded, and that of the "Heart Stone" is brought to a better termination than we had hoped for; indeed we have little doubt this tale will read well when published by itself, though in the "Penny Post" much of it seemed sadly out of place. We have only to take exception to one short article on "Our Mother," the meaning of which is, to say the least, dubious. But, on the whole, we can congratulate Churchmen on the real amelioration in this little periodical, and sincerely trust that it may prove continuous.

III.—*Reuben Medlicott; or, the Coming Man*. By M. N. SAVAGE, Esq. London: Chapman and Hall. 1852.

EXCEEDINGLY amusing and entertaining, though without any stirring interest either of feeling or principle. The lesson which the author desires to inculcate is, "a signal example of what little is to be done in this busy world by much knowledge, much talent, much ambition,—nay, even much activity,—without singleness of aim, and steadiness of purpose." This lesson is ably taught, though the last half of the last volume might, we think, have been rendered more agreeable, with little, if any loss, to the moral. It is uncomfortable, too, to see characters of lesser power and lower sentiment succeeding by the very want of qualities which we *ought* to revere and admire. The *dramatis personæ* are well imagined, and well acted out; the Dean Bishop, the wine merchant, the successful chaplain, the elocutionist, the musical shoemaker, Mademoiselle Louise, the Quakers, and the citizens of Chichester, are all admirably conceived and executed, though with some strokes of decided exaggeration.

IV.—*The Hero's Funeral. A Poem. By* ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., *Author of "The Christian Life," "The Omnipresence of the Deity," &c.* London: Routledge. 1853. [pp. 31.]

THOUGH this noble poem has only reached us as we were going to press, we feel bound to make room for some notice of it, however hurried or insufficient. Great as is its author's fame, we doubt much whether future ages will not consider the present production as one of his most solid claims to immortality. That his own more especial admirers in the present day will do so we do not think, for there is decidedly less of "Montgomeryism" about this *brochure* than about any previous efforts of his muse. He indeed seems to have well-nigh forgotten his own individuality in the living, overpowering consciousness of the scene in which he was a partaker—for to those who witnessed any part of the great mourning to use the expression *actor* would seem offensive. He appears to have felt, and rightly felt, that whatever were the merits of his own high genius, Robert Montgomery had no right to claim the privilege of an individual existence in the presence of Arthur Duke of Wellington: and thus his poem reminds us of all the power and all the eulogy with none of the adulation, distinguishable in the laudatory odes of Dryden—what that mighty minstrel did under compulsion, Montgomery has done upon free will, and divesting himself as far as it is possible of every accident separable from the idea of a true Englishman and a great poet, he has celebrated with becoming reverence the obsequies of the greatest Englishman.

Our first extract describes the deep, solemn, anxious anticipation which was felt by all those who awaited the coming day:—

" With a feverish awe oppressed,
And a something in the breast
Neither tones nor tears explain,
Like a mute and mighty pain,
Or a pulse of patient grief
Too august for word-relief,—
Millions now are slumberless;
And in thinking loneliness
Are brooding o'er the unbreathed thought,—
To-morrow down to dust is brought
That hoary Chief, whose high career
Will range half Europe round his bier;
Who fifteen battles fought and won,
Nor left nor lost a British gun,
But took three thousand cannon from the foe
The thunder of his charge had laid in battle low!"

None who witnessed, as we did, the picture which the poet has here painted, will fail to acknowledge the felicitous accuracy of his description, when as the hour approached—

“ On window, roof, and balcony,
Where foot can stand, or eye can see ;
By churchyard gate, or garden wall,
Near porch and palace, hut and hall,
Crowd human forms, like clustering bees,
That swarm at morn on summer trees ;
While clashing with incessant jar,
Rush chariot wheels and rolling car ;
Horse and horseman then combine,
Clear the way and close the line :—
Still the trooping thousands come ! ”

The commencement of the procession is with a similar happiness thus spoken of :—

“ ’Tis eight o’clock by matin chime ;
And signal guns announce the time,
While countless numbers, mute with breathless trance,
Seem melted into one, to view the Pomp advance.—
With lingering preludes long and low,
Comes marching on serene and slow,
’Mid symphonies of solemn woe,
Yon Cavalcade of Death !
With mourning trump and muffled drum,
Behold the vast procession come,—
And hold your pausing breath.
Cornet, flute, and clarion pour
Mingled death-wails more and more,
Bannerets and blazonry,
With plumes of towering pageantry,
Streaming Flag and Gonfalon,
Colours out of carnage won,
Mingled with the harnessed gun,
Rifles, Horse, and Fusileer,
Dragoon, Marine, and Grenadier,
And scarworn Pensioners, with sable wands
That faintly quivered in their feeble hands,
Steed and soldiers’ measured pace
Wearing each some mourning trace,
While sob and sigh intensely show
The heavings of the heart below.”

With equally keen perception the poet has seized on that most pathetic spectacle, the warrior’s horse,—to us there was nothing in the whole procession so deeply, truly, livingly touching as the melancholy bearing of that noble animal ; he seemed fully to enter

into the grief of those around him, and entirely to realize in his own person the loss of his heroic master.

But let us resume :—

“ Hark ! again the muffled drum,
While the plumed Battalions come,
Timing deep their measured tread,
To the March surnamed the Dead,
Rise in file, in single rank,
Ringing out a hollow clank :—
Mingle with the martial scene
Mailed Guard and red Marine,
Foot and horse artillery,
And brigades of infantry.

And when, to end the vast array,
Hussar and Lancer lined the way,
The wailing Piper next, a pibroch blew,
And coronach that thrill'd the soul of Feeling through.”

The truthfulness of the following lines will be appreciated by all those who were present on the occasion which they describe, and who duly honour the hero whom they celebrate.

“ Round that high Car though countless hosts assembled,
And under pawing steeds the pathways trembled,
You might have heard your heart-pulse beat,
So hush'd became the o'er-awed street !
And pale, as if with inward prayer,
The living Mass stood gazing there,
With heads uncover'd, and with moisten'd eyes,
Whose silence uttered,—There a Hero lies !
From whom, when call'd to bid the world farewell,
The truncheons of eight laurell'd Armies fell ;
The pillar of our Church and State
By self-renouncement nobly great ;
Who in the storm of public danger stood,
Bold as the rock that baffles ocean's flood,
The truest Patriot since our throne began,
The perfect model of an ENGLISHMAN.”

v.—*History of Europe, from the Fall of Napoleon in MDCCCXV. to the Accession of Louis Napoleon in MDCCCLII. By Sir ARCHIBALD ALISON, Bart. Vol. I. London and Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons.*

WE rejoice to see the pen of Sir Archibald Alison engaged on a subject well worthy of it,—the history of Europe for the last thirty-five years. To no one could this task be so appropriately

assigned as to the distinguished historian of the revolutionary war, because no one can be more competent to take up the thread of events, and trace their connexion with preceding causes. The work, however, is necessarily of a character altogether different from that of the former history. The first volume, according to the preface, includes the period of time commencing with the entry of the allies into Paris, after the fall of Napoleon, and terminates with the passing of the Currency Act of 1819 in England, and the great creation of peers in the democratic interest during the same year in France. We have read some portions of this volume, and find it every where bearing the evidences of the same praiseworthy research, the same manly style of composition, and the same class of political principles which have given such well-merited celebrity to the distinguished author's name.

VI.—*The Colloquies of Edward Osborne, Citizen and Clothworker of London. As reported by ye Authour of "Mary Powell."* London: Hall, Virtue, and Co.

"THE maiden and married life of Mary Powell," otherwise Milton, is, without doubt, known to many of our readers. We can recommend to them with confidence the "Colloquies of Edward Osborne," as quite equal, in all respects, to its predecessor. It describes the fortunes of a young apprentice in London during the reigns of Edward the Sixth, Mary, and Elizabeth, and his marriage to a wealthy heiress. The descriptions which it gives of life, and habits, and of the events of the times, are admirably and most graphically written.

VII.—*The Church in the Apostolic Age. By HENRY W. J. THIERSCH, Doctor of Philosophy and Theology. Translated from the German. By THOMAS CARLYLE, Esq.* London: Bosworth.

THIS work exhibits, in some respects, much sounder views than many publications of the German schools, but it is evidently strongly tinged with the doctrines of Irvingism, and is translated by an Irvingite who has considerably developed its tendencies in his annotations.

VIII.—*Gilbert's Clergyman's Almanack, and Churchman's Miscellany for 1853.* For the Company of Stationers.

THE present edition of this well-known almanack appears to be most carefully and ably edited, comprising the fullest and most

authentic body of information on all matters concerning the Church of England and the Universities. It ought to be in the hands of every Clergyman.

ix.—*A Complete Greek and English Lexicon for the Poems of Homer, and the Homeridæ, &c.* By G. CH. CRUSIUS. Translated from the German, with corrections and additions, by HENRY SMITH. Revised and Edited by the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD. London: Rivingtons.

THIS is probably the most complete and convenient lexicon for the study of Homer now in existence. The results of an immense amount of classical knowledge and research are comprised within its compass.

x.—*The Pentateuch and its Assailants. A Refutation of the Objections of Modern Scepticism to the Pentateuch.* By WILLIAM T. HAMILTON, D.D., Pastor of the Government Street Church, Mobile, Ala. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THIS important work commences with a description of the German Neological mode of interpretation; then enters on the discussion of the character of Moses as a scholar and a statesman; of the necessity of revelation; of the Bible as a revelation from God; of the Pentateuch as a genuine and authentic work of Moses; of the inspiration of the book of Genesis; of the creation in six days; of the populousness of the earth in the days of Cain, and the longevity of the ancient patriarchs; of the antediluvian giants; of the universal deluge; of the origin and extent of death, and of the common origin of man. The object is to maintain the inspiration of the Bible as the Word of God; and a great amount of learning and research appears to have been bestowed in the composition of this defence of the first principles of true religion. We would hope to bestow on this work hereafter a more careful examination than time or space now permits us.

xi.—*A Short Explanation of the Epistles and Gospels of the Christian Year; with Questions for the use of Schools.* London: Bell.

ONE of the most useful little books we have seen for some time. It is admirably adapted for Sunday-school teachers who need assistance in their work.

XII.—*The Convocations of the Two Provinces; their Origin, Constitution, and Forms of Proceeding: with a Chapter on their Revival.* By GEORGE TREVOR, M.A., Canon of York, &c. London: Mozley.

THIS is the most convenient and complete work extant on the history and constitution of Convocation. It will, of course, be in the hands of all who are interested in the restoration of that body to activity.

XIII.—*Parochial Sermons, preached in a Village Church. Third Series.* By the Rev. C. A. HEURTLEY, B.D., &c. Oxford: J. H. Parker.

WE have had occasion to notice the former volumes of Mr. Heurtley's sermons as distinguished by a solidity of judgment, and a sincere and unaffected piety, which in these times are more than ever valuable. The volume before us appears to maintain most fully the high reputation of the author.

XIV.—*The Fall of Man; from Milton's Paradise Lost.* By the Rev. CHARLES EYRE, A.B., &c. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

The idea of this work is a bold one. It is to carve out from the "Paradise Lost" a smaller poem more strictly epical. We have, therefore, here an abridgment of Milton in his own words.

XV.—*A Letter to the Right Hon. the Earl of Shaftesbury on the Establishment of Ragged School Churches.* By the Rev. W. E. RICHARDSON, B.A., Curate of All Saints, Northampton. London: Hatchard.

THIS interesting pamphlet suggests an idea which is well deserving of the notice of those who are anxious for the improvement of the poorer classes—the erection of churches in connexion with the ragged schools. We must place before the reader a few extracts illustrative of the plans of the author:—

"I have thus, my Lord, attempted to point to the causes which have operated to prevent the attendance of the poor of our large towns, not only at churches in general, but *even* at those churches which have been more especially designed for their benefit; I have further attempted to suggest a remedy for this great existing evil by the establishment of Ragged School Churches; and will proceed now to notice more in detail the working of the system which I advocate, making this observation in passing—that the remedy which I propose

is simply to be regarded as provisional, lasting only until the district where the Ragged Church has been erected shall have been brought into such a healthy condition as that it may be formed into an ecclesiastical district, with its own parish church.

"The heading which I have attached to this letter, as well as my remarks in page 4, will have made it evident that I advocate the erection of a building for the double purpose of a church and school. Such a building cannot, I am aware, receive consecration at the hands of a bishop, but it may obtain his licence; neither can it have a clergyman specially appointed to it, but yet it may be regularly served by one of the curates attached to the parish church, who shall regard this Ragged Church, and the district lying around, as more immediately committed to his charge."—pp. 8, 9.

The plans, it appears, have been already tried at Northampton with much success.

"In the year 1849 the town of Northampton was, along with the rest of England, visited by that terrific scourge, the cholera: its ravages were more particularly fatal in a part of the town called the South Quarter, which lay on low meadow-land, and was thickly inhabited. After the abating of the disease, a meeting of some of the leading parishioners, more especially of those inhabiting the ravaged district, was held, when it was resolved to erect a building to be set apart as a school and a house of prayer in connexion with the Church of England, as a thank-offering for the removal of the cholera. This plan, meeting with the co-operation of the vicar of the parish, was immediately carried into execution, and in July, 1850, the building was opened by the Lord Bishop of Peterborough, who kindly consented to preach the opening sermon, and thus publicly to testify to his approval of the work. His Lordship, further, was so much pleased with the plan, that, on his return to Peterborough, he was the instrument in causing the erection of a similar building in a destitute quarter of that city. In the Ragged Church, thus auspiciously opened, divine service was forthwith celebrated, and in process of time Sunday schools, evening classes for both sexes, and an infant school respectively occupied the building; and though, from the services having at first been alternated Sunday mornings and evenings, with the vain hope of inducing the poor to attend the morning service, the success did not correspond to the anticipations which had been raised, yet, on the regular adoption of an evening service, which had been urged by many from the very first, the attendance rapidly increased, until at the present time but few vacant seats can be perceived. A further good resulted from this alteration, as the building could now be opened in the morning for a service specially adapted to the school children; from which service, however, those of the parishioners who chose to attend were not excluded.

"These were the circumstances which attended the erection of the All Saints' Ragged Church, which has, since its opening, exercised a most beneficial influence in the neighbourhood; not only gathering

together many to attend its services, but also, by its Sunday, week-day, and evening schools, impressing upon the minds of the young the great truths of Christianity. It may here further be noted, that besides these direct advantages, many indirect benefits have accrued from the building being used for the joint purpose both of a church and school, and this amongst the chief, that the children, more especially those belonging to the evening classes, have become so attached to the building that they are frequently induced to attend the services. The parents also, by the description of the children, are oftentimes tempted to drop in, just to see what sort of a place it is, and are afterwards to be found amongst the regular attendants.

“It is such a building, my Lord, as the one I have just described, that I desire to see erected in some of the worst localities of our metropolis, and other large towns; and I feel fully persuaded in my own mind, that if a clergyman, of piety and experience, who can count all things but loss for the simple object of winning souls unto Christ, is appointed to labour in such a sphere, that the building, notwithstanding many discouragements it may have to sustain, will yet speedily form, as it were, a missionary station, and be the means of rescuing many from a life of sin and wretchedness, who otherwise, in all probability, must have perished.”—pp. 9—12.

We must refer the reader to the pamphlet for the further development of the plan, which appears to be deserving of an attentive consideration.

XVI.—*Sermons. Second Series. Preached at Rome during the Seasons of 1850-1851, and 1851-1852. By FRANCIS B. WOODWARD, M.A., Chaplain to the English Congregation.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS volume of discourses appears to evince very considerable intellectual power and ability. They are generally argumentative, and enter on topics which are only adapted to an educated congregation. Their tone appears to be high and orthodox.

XVII.—*The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles the Fifth. By WILLIAM STIRLING, Author of the “Annals of the Artists of Spain.”* London: J. W. Parker.

THIS volume presents the Emperor Charles V. in a less pleasing light than we could have anticipated; and its details wholly do away with the romance of his abdication of the crown. In these pages he appears as a *gourmand*, an instigator of persecution, and a superstitious fanatic. The work is, however, a very curious and amusing one, and deserves perusal.

- xviii.—*A Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion.* By THEODORE PARKER, *Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury, Mass.* London: Chapman.

THIS work may be compared for virulent infidelity and blasphemy to the publications of Paine. It is an attack on the essentials of religion, conducted on the method of the German Rationalists.

- xix.—*Handbook to Convocation.* By HENRY J. RHODES, *M.A., Curate of St. Nicholas, Abingdon.* London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

THE compiler of this curious little work must have bestowed great pains in collecting the materials. It states the opinions of all the members of Convocation as far as they can be ascertained.

- xx.—*The Life of James Bonnell.* London: Masters.

THE first volume of an intended biographical series. If those that are to follow should be in any degree as useful, and as unexceptionable, as this republication of the life of Bonnell, a real benefit will be conferred on the Church by their publication.

- xxi.—*The Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* By the Rev W. J. CONYBEARE, *M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Rev. J. L. Howson, M.A., Principal of the Collegiate Institution, Liverpool.* In 2 vols. 4to. London: Longmans.

FROM all we have been enabled to see of this great work, it would appear to be amongst the most valuable contributions of modern criticism to the knowledge of the sacred volume. It brings the researches of the most eminent men on all the direct and collateral sources, to bear on the illustration of the life and writings of the Apostle of the Gentiles; and landscape pictorial illustrations are introduced, thus connecting the associations of scenery and natural objects with the history of St. Paul. We trust that it will have the circulation which its many and high merits deserve.

- xxii.—*A Church Dictionary.* By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, *D.D., Vicar of Leeds.* Sixth Edition. London: Murray.

DR. Hook's Church Dictionary has acquired a circulation, and a position as a standard work, which places it above our recom-

mendations. The present edition has been carefully revised and improved, with an especial view to the prevailing tendencies of the times.

XXIII.—*The Rule of the Church a Law to all her Members; or, Faith and Obedience in Relation to the Church. A Sermon preached in St. Andrew's Church, before the Bishops and Clergy of Aberdeen. By the Rev. J. CHRISTIE, M.A., &c. Edinburgh: Lendrum.*

THIS discourse has been reprinted from the Scottish Magazine for circulation. It urges the revival of the sacramental system in all its integrity. In the following passage the author remarks on the present neglect of this system; and urges an entire obedience to all the rubrics, and the restoration of all rites, forms, and customs sanctioned in the Book of Common Prayer:—

“At our ordination, we profess our belief that the Church is ‘the pillar and ground of the Truth,’ ‘the Spouse of the Lamb,’ ‘the Body of Christ.’ We declare our belief that Her doctrines and ordinances, Her rites and ceremonies, Her holy Provision, and Sacramental system, are sound and scriptural; and we solemnly vow to ‘give faithful diligence to minister the doctrine, and sacraments, and discipline of the Church, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same.’ We say that we believe—we vow that we believe—that She is a sound branch of the True Vine. We aver our belief in the beauty of Her various requirements, and yet, if we test our faith, to what in reality do our averments, our professions, and our vows practically amount? They manifest, alas! absence of faith in the Church’s ‘provision.’ One acts in this way, another in that: one adopts this part of Her ‘provision,’ and another a different, as if it were left to each individual to ‘do what is right in his own eyes,’ instead of there having been a given rule to all. Her laws, as set forth in Rubrics and Canons, are but partially observed. They are, in too many instances, treated as if they were dead letters, and as if we ourselves had not sworn to obey them. Her Fasts and Feasts, Her daily Prayers and weekly Eucharists, Her course of service and round of holy seasons, are neither earnestly, nor fondly, nor eagerly embraced and followed. But to make reserves, to question and select, to act a little, to act when we think proper, or when it will be prudent to act, to obey more or less, is proof that we believe a little, that we believe more or less; is proof, in short, that we have a partial faith. If we had living faith in the Church and in Her system, we would act,—we would manifest it by a due observance of Her injunctions. True faith leads on to holy obedience, without calculating, without selecting, without picking and choosing. It ‘hath respect unto the recompense of the reward;’ ‘being fully persuaded that what God hath promised He is able also

to perform.' 'I will abundantly bless Her provision.' 'The generation of the faithful shall be blessed.'"—pp. 7, 8.

"Not to speak at present of Her other requirements, we must not neglect Her voice calling us to a daily prayer. If we wish to have 'Faith, hope, and charity,' we must, like the saints of old, 'take refuge in prayer.' If we wait upon God as they did, if we seek Him as Daniel, as Anna, and St. Paul, like them we shall 'know whom we have believed.' We shall have a right faith and a right obedience. We have but to believe, ask, and pray, and 'according to our faith so shall it be done unto us.' 'The living body of the Church,' says the earnest-minded Bishop Doane, 'breathes in its prayers. When Saul was turned to God, the Lord said of him, 'Behold he prayeth.' 'Prayer is the Church's breath of life. The first believers were continually in prayer.' 'They continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayer.' They were daily 'with one accord in prayer and supplication.' They continued 'instant in prayer.' They prayed 'without ceasing.' When shall it again be so? When shall there be but 'one mind and one mouth;' one spirit breathing through the Church its earnest voice with God? When shall the daily incense rise from every altar, and from every hearth, like the sweet pulses of a sleeping infant's breath, acceptable before Him, through the name which is 'as ointment poured forth;' like those 'golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints?' 'Prayer is the Church's breath of life.' How mightily would we prevail with God, if in every Church daily prayer ascended to his throne of grace! Thus might we bow the heavens! Thus might we bring down one mighty to save! Thus might we bring sure deliverance to the Church and Her children! 'The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him; yea all such as call upon Him faithfully. He will fulfil the desire of them that fear Him. He also will hear their cry and will help them.' 'I will surely bless Her provision.'

"And if simple, common prayer is of such mighty efficacy, how much more potent is the Eucharist—the Prayer—the LITURGY—the most perfect and consummate action,' as Jeremy Taylor says, 'among all the instances of religion, union of mysteries, and a consolidation of duties'—τέλειον, as it was anciently characterized—PERFECTIVE—the finishing of the man in the school of Christ! How potent, when we offer up the great Memorial Sacrifice of our salvation—when we plead before Almighty God the merits of His Son's sacrifice, and feast upon His precious body and blood to everlasting life; yes, when we plead that 'by the merits and death of His Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His blood, we and all His whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion!' How potent, were the Eucharist celebrated weekly and on feast days; nay, even daily, as the Church requires. St. Ignatius assures us, that 'when the Eucharist is daily celebrated, we break the powers of Satan, who turns all his actions into hostilities and darts of fire.'

"But it is not merely in the use of the Church's greater means of

grace, Her prayers, and Sacraments, that we may mightily prevail with God, and bring down blessings upon ourselves and people. It is by exhibiting and using Her whole provision, even in those points which seem to us of minor importance, in obeying Her injunctions; for instance, in duly and regularly intimating Her Ember and Rogation days, Her Vigils, Her Fasts and Feasts, at the proper time and from the proper place—immediately after the Nicene Creed and from the Holy Altar; and then going on to observe in *deed* those holy seasons, of whose existence and obligation we give notice in words. We must obey Her whole system to the very letter, even in such points as these, even in Her very ceremonies, if we wish ‘God surely to bless to us Her provision.’ All Her ministrations as well as Her Prayers and Sacraments, all Her ceremonies and holy appointments, are all actual means of grace, abounding with life and spiritual energy. Do we not remember the case of Naaman, the Syrian? To prove his faith, Elisha required him to perform a ceremony which he, in his overweening pride, deemed too trifling and insignificant to be followed. He would scrupulously have obeyed a precept which he conceived to be rife with grace and healing. He was willing to ‘do some *great* thing.’ But his refusal to comply in little things manifested his unbelief, as ours also, brethren, is proved, when we yield not obedience to the Church’s orders and ceremonies, because we fancy they are unimportant and may be left undone. Our Lord would now prove the sincerity and fulness of our faith, as the Prophet did Naaman’s, by obedience to the Church’s least things as well as to Her greatest.”—pp. 11, 12.

We cannot but think that this notion of enforcing the directions of the Church on the least things, as well as in the greatest, proceeds on a mistaken view; that it ascribes to the changeable and human institutions of the Church, which are only matters of discipline and expediency, the same degree of sacredness and obligation, as if they had proceeded from the Divine institution; and the whole view taken appears to us to place the mere carrying out of the Church’s injunctions, right and good as they are in themselves, in too prominent a place amongst Christian duties. The principle of obedience to the Church is right; but it should only come in subordinately to the principle of obedience to God Himself, and faith in His Son. We think that it is frequently made to take a place which does not belong to it.

XXIV.—*The Greek Testament, with a Critically revised Text; a Digest of Various Readings; Marginal References to Verbal and Idiomatic Usage; Prolegomena; and a copious Critical and Exegetical Commentary.* By HENRY ALFORD, B.D., &c. In 3 vols. London: Rivingtons.

THE title of this work will show the comprehensive nature of its

contents. The present volume (II.) appears much more carefully and judiciously compiled than the former; and although the substance is derived from German commentators, and not without some infusion of their spirit—far less so, however, in this volume than in the former—we trust that it will be found, on the whole, to be a useful work. A decided opinion, however, on the merits of this volume, would require a larger examination than we are enabled at present to afford.

xxv.—*Confession and Absolution. A Letter to the Very Rev. the Dean of Exeter, in a Sermon preached by him, &c. By*
HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER. London: Murray.

FEW antagonists are competent to grapple with the Bishop of Exeter in controversy. The pamphlet before us is characterized by the well-known ability and courage which so eminently distinguish that illustrious prelate. A sermon preached by the Dean of Exeter against the Romish doctrine of Confession and Absolution, and against those who are seeking to restore that doctrine and practice, led to a correspondence between the Bishop and the Dean, out of which the publication before us has grown. On the general subject-matter of that discussion we have on former occasions unreservedly stated our opinions; and on the present we shall limit ourselves to some extracts from the Bishop's Letter, referring to some interesting topics. The Bishop thus alludes to certain painful circumstances:—

“In your explanatory letter of 19th November, you mention a supposed imposition of a penance by Mr. Prynne, on which you comment (how justly, much more how charitably, I stop not to inquire). It is enough for my purpose to remark, which I do with an apology for taking the liberty of saying it, that you are here chargeable with a degree of inadvertence, which, in one less learned than yourself, might reasonably be ascribed to ignorance. Penances, according to the Church of Rome, are works of *satisfaction to the justice of God*, imposed by the priest, in lieu of suffering the pains, not of hell (from these the sinner is relieved by absolution), but of *Purgatory*, which would else remain to be endured, after the final salvation of the party has been secured by the sacrament. Penances, in short, are, in the Roman system, essentially connected with Purgatory. To say, therefore, of any Christian minister, as you say of Mr. Prynne in your letter of the 19th, ‘that the penance which he imposed, you presume after confession, affords a very strong ground of presumption that he is prepared to carry to their full extent some of the very worst practices of the Romish Confessional;’—is in effect to say, that Mr. Prynne believes, and is ready to teach and act upon the belief, that the Romish doctrine of Purgatory is true—notwithstanding he has repeatedly and solemnly declared, as the very condition of his

admission to holy orders, and to the cure of souls 'amongst us, that that doctrine is 'a fond thing vainly invented, grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.'

"Such is, in effect, your charge against Mr. Prynne. Can you have been in earnest in making it? I think not.—But, if not, why did you write thus of him? Is it possible that you could permit yourself to catch at a popular clamour, for the mere purpose of justifying what, without some such pretence, you felt it impossible to justify,—the line of argument followed by you in your sermon?

"Respecting Mr. Prynne, let me speak my sentiments fully and openly. That he is a most zealous, devoted, single-minded labourer in the Lord's vineyard, I am quite sure. That he has, with the blessing of God, laboured, in the main, successfully, I have very strong reason to believe. With a stipend not exceeding that of a curate, out of which he has to pay the rent of his house, and known to be otherwise in the most straitened circumstances, he has not sought to increase his means of supporting a wife and children by receiving pupils, or having recourse to any other legitimate occupation; but he has given all his time, all his faculties of mind and body, to his holy calling. Divine service is celebrated in his church every morning and evening—the holy Communion daily; and this daily service, especially on holidays, is very numerously attended,—better, I am told, in comparison, than that of Sundays. What may be the feelings towards him among the higher classes of his own people, I know not; but I have no reason to believe that they are other than favourable: one thing I can confidently state, that, although during the late excitement I expressly invited complaints against him from his parishioners, if they had any thing to complain of, not one complaint from any one of them reached me—nay, I am assured, that among the numerous requisitionists of the recent public meeting, there was not the name of a single member of his congregation. This, considering the occasion of that meeting, is most unaccountable, if his doctrines and practices are such as have been supposed. But, be the feelings towards him of other classes what they may, 'Among the resident poor he certainly is beloved, and deserves to be; for though his manners are not prepossessing, he is really sterling, and acts, I am convinced, from the highest principles of Christian duty.' Such is the testimony given to me, of him, by one who has no connexion with Mr. Prynne, no reason, no prejudice, to predispose him in his favour, no inducement to speak or write of him at all, but that one strong inducement to an honourable, a Christian man, a sense of the gross injustice with which he has been assailed.

"Against such a man, persecuted as he has been, while I shall be always ready to receive and to attend to any complaints purporting to be supported by sufficient evidence, never will I follow a multitude lightly to speak evil. He may be—probably he is—indiscreet. When I held the recent inquiry at Plymouth I expected—and I avowed that I expected—great indiscretion to be proved against him. But on that occasion nothing, in my judgment, was proved by evidence worthy of

any regard; and therefore I felt it my duty to declare this judgment at whatever hazard of clamour and misrepresentation.

“Having said thus much of Mr. Prynne, the only individual to whose proceedings you refer, I will now address myself to the specific matter which you allege against him—‘the penance’ which it has been said was ‘imposed’ by him on a young lady after confession. The story, I believe, is, that he required her to make a cross with her tongue on the bare floor; and it rests on the following evidence:—A clergyman of Cambridgeshire, in whose parish, I believe, the young lady’s family reside, stated that she, being an inmate of Miss Sellon’s establishment at Plymouth, had, while resident there, gone to Mr. Prynne, who received her confession—and, having received it, ‘imposed the penance’ (such is your phrase) which I have recited. This, he says, he was told by the young lady herself. The publication of the statement caused, as was to be expected, a very strong feeling of public odium against Mr. Prynne. He addressed the members of his congregation on this matter, and told them that ‘although he had not the slightest recollection of ever having given Miss —— such a penance yet, if she has really stated that she distinctly remembers that he did, he should be willing to admit that it might have been so, as he would far rather think that he had given it than that she had really stated what was untrue.’ He added, that ‘he wrote to the young lady herself, desiring her to say whether she distinctly remembered the fact to have been as was stated—that to this letter he received no answer—and therefore that he does not believe it was allowed to reach her.’”—pp. 20—23.

The Bishop thus continues his remarks on the conduct attributed to Mr. Prynne:—

“If there be any truth in the story (and I admit it seems strange that Mr. Prynne was unable to give from his own memory a peremptory contradiction of it), I think we have a probable solution in the fact that some great authorities on confession—Bishop Andrewes, if I forget not, is of the number—recommend, as a good discipline of the penitent, that he should punish the member that has been the instrument of offence; and as in this lady’s case the tongue was the peccant member, she may have herself proposed the penance, and Mr. Prynne may have given his sanction to it. For he tells us of his own experience—what *à priori* is very likely—that persons, after receiving absolution, ‘in the enthusiasm of their gratitude and love, often seek to have burthens laid upon them, which a prudent guide will rather check.’ Cranmer almost redeemed, in popular repute, the ignominy of his fivefold or sixfold recantation, by thrusting first into the flames the ‘unworthy hand’ (as he termed it) which had written the document of his shame. Miss —— may have felt similar indignation against her tongue, and may have rejoiced to exercise this somewhat lighter vengeance against it. After all, if Mr. Prynne did indeed of his own mere motion impose such a penance, I think that he merits very much of the censure which

he has received ; but till this is proved on better evidence than has yet been adduced, I cannot, as an honest man, join in treating him as guilty.

“ I return to your statement respecting penance : and on this matter you must bear with me when I say, that if the story against Mr. Prynne were true to the very letter, there is nothing in it which justifies any one in professing to see Popery in it ; for I repeat, Romish penances are imposed by the priest in the tribunal of confession on unwilling subjects, as satisfactions to the justice of God, which must else be satisfied by the pains of purgatory ; whereas penances recommended (never, I believe, imposed) by clergymen who receive confession among ourselves are of a wholly different kind—they are proposed to willing parties, accepted or declined at pleasure, not as penalties for the past, but as helps against evil habits for the future—remedies of some besetting sin—instruments, in short, of spiritual discipline. They are like the rule of a Temperance Society, but without the pledge.

“ Persons may differ as to the expediency of such a practice ; and, for myself, I hesitate not to say that, in my judgment, the *habit* of going to confession, without some special reason, is likely to produce very grave mischief in many cases—to impair the healthy tone of a Christian conscience, just as constant and unnecessary recourse to medicine weakens the constitution of the body. But this is a matter which the Church leaves open to the discretion of its members, both lay and clerical ; and I disclaim the right of interfering with it, beyond saying, as I again say, to my clergy, that I disapprove it.”—pp. 23, 24.

XXVI.—*The Dramatic Works of Sir THOMAS NOON TALFOURD, D.C.L. Eleventh Edition ; to which are added, a few Sonnets and Verses.* London. Moxon. 1852.

ANOTHER testimony to the falsehood of the dictum, that poetry is not read in these days—is not a saleable commodity. Here is an *eleventh* edition of contributions to the most unpopular of all poetical departments with *readers*, namely, the dramatic. The public was nauseated with the puling sentimental strains of certain lady-poetesses some twenty years ago, and the reaction is not yet complete. The accomplishment of easy rhyme was very general in Pope's day ; but the deeply sentimental has only become common property in later times ; and true poets have suffered grievously in consequence. Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd's works have now attained to the standard of English classics, and do not need our praises ; but this last and beautiful edition, published at a very reasonable price, provokes some friendly notice. It were vain to speak of the statuesque grace, the calm felicity, the noble spirit of antiquity, which distinguish “ Ion ;”

for we cannot forbear citing some few lines descriptive of the gentle character, which will speak for themselves :—

“ Ion, our sometime darling, whom we prized
 As a stray gift, by bounteous Heaven dismiss'd
 From some bright sphere, which sorrow may not cloud
 To make the happy happier ! Is *he* sent
 To grapple with the miseries of this time,
 Whose nature such ethereal aspect wears
 As it would perish at the touch of wrong !
 By no internal contest is he train'd
 For such hard duty ; no emotions rude
 Has his clear spirit vanquish'd. Love, the germ
 Of his mild nature, has spread graces forth,
 Expanding with its progress, *as the store
 Of rainbow colour, which the seed conceals,
 Sheds out its tints from its dim treasury,
 To flush and circle in the flower.* No tear
 Has fill'd his eye, save that of thoughtful joy,
 When in the evening stillness lovely things
 Press'd on his soul too busily ; his voice,
 If in the earnestness of childish sports,
 Raised to the tone of anger, *check'd its force,
 As if it fear'd to break its being's law,
 And falter'd into music.*

• • • • •

So his life has flow'd
 From its mysterious urn a sacred stream,
 In whose calm depth the beautiful and pure
 Alone are mirror'd ; which, though shapes of ill
 May hover round its surface, glides in light,
 And takes no shadow from them.”

The character of Adrastus is admirably portrayed and embodied ; and the scenes betwixt him and Ion have a most vivid and exciting interest. “ Glencoe ” is a most interesting play, and must be a great favourite, we should suppose, with highlanders, so faithfully does it reflect the stern and savage beauties of their mountain-land ; where, as the noble Halbert Macdonald says (of all this author's dramatic creations, perhaps the one which appeals most powerfully to our sympathies :)—

“ 'Neath the moon
 Our three huge mountain-bulwarks stood in light,
 Strange, solemn, spectral ; *not as if they tower'd
 Majestic into heaven, but hoar and bow'd
 Beneath the weight of centuries.*”

XXVII.—*Vacation Rambles. Comprising the Recollections of Three Continental Tours, in the Vacations of 1841, 1842, and 1843. By Sir T. N. TALFOURD, D.C.L. Third Edition. London: Moxon.*

ONE of the most delightful, good-natured, sensible, gossiping books of travel we ever remember to have met with. Were this the proper season of the year we might be tempted to descant at some length upon its merits. As it is, we cannot refrain from saying, that those who have trodden the same ground with the learned judge will derive no little pleasure, as we have done, from retracing their footsteps by his side, while the untravelled can possess themselves of no work which gives more graphic delineations of the scenery of the Rhine and Switzerland, and more happy sketches of foreign ways and habits. A singularly good-natured book is this, as we have said, not blindly so, but still mild and charitable to almost all the world, with one marked exception. Every man, says a French proverb, has his "*bête noir*:" and surely the *bête noir* or bogy of this most pleasant traveller is Lord Byron, whose self and poetry he manifestly holds in great abhorrence. Thus in an interesting passage discussing the advantages of an attempt to climb to the summit of Mont Blanc, alluding to Mr. Murray's "*Guide Book*," and having observed that it may be considered as the virtual representation of all the respectable common-place on this subject, he goes on to speak of "one of those few passages which lead to nothing, and which, *with the quotations from Lord Byron*, may be regarded as *taxes on the first necessary of travelling life*." With one longer and really valuable extract illustrating incidentally the same tone of feeling, we shall conclude:—

"I gazed on the scenes among which Rousseau has placed the few incidents of his eloquent but sickly romance, among which the 'Hotel Byron' now towers, and the interest of which is weakened, if not distorted, when they are contemplated through the medium of Lord Byron's praise. The fictions of Rousseau's brain, discoloured as they are by sophistry, vindicate a truth in our experience from the intense feeling with which the author himself regards them; while even the physical realities of this scenery lose their individuality, while the poetical commentator forgets them in himself, and, professing to interpret their spirit, only develops his own. Lord Byron, amid the many-coloured mockeries of his life, wished to be thought the mournful enthusiast, which Rousseau was; but the difference remains between a flaming reality and a phosphoric illusion. It was natural for Rousseau, familiar with the village of Clarens and the rocks of Meillerie, to take them for the scenes of his story; but there is no truth in the elaborate stanzas of Lord Byron which, passing by the influences which genius can shed abroad on external nature, 'peopling it with affec-

tions,' represent these spots as peculiarly the 'a sound, and sense, and sight of sweetness.' 'T has spread itself a couch, the Alps have reared the opening of the wide gorge of a large turbid allow an approach even with the sound of its irregular pinnacles of the Dent du Midi, rising a tains, noble as those features are, do not suggest in which 'early Love his Psyche's zone unbound loveliness.' Clarens has no aspect of the 'birth-long, dull, bricky village, stretching along the wooded hill—steep enough for weariness, but r trees do not 'take root in love,' at least they do of such sweet nurture—all things are (not) here o arid, uninviting—suspended between ugliness and no touch of loveliness except that with which has tinted them. The whole scene—lake, rock one which may inspire great thoughts—thoughts strengthen the sinews of the mind, not to arra sadness; attractions the reverse of those with wh has arrayed it."

XXVIII.—*Romanism an Apostate Church.*

London: Longmans. [12mo. pp. 460.]

THE author of this work assails with no gent ists and the Tractarian party. Its style is i higher classes, but we have no doubt that it though vigorous, attacks on popery will renc regret that the author should have spoken o the Church in terms so offensive as he has d they have not proceeded against Tractarianis his own views would have led him to prefe work also appears to us too violent generally, circulation by the clergy. But it certainly co of extremely useful and valuable matter, and a place in the libraries of those who might fiery violence and its occasional errors fr volume. It appears to us, that the fault of t author discloses at once all his own feeling popish wickedness, before he has taken his process which is necessary to bring him up. The work, however, is well worthy of atten conclusion of the volume we have a collecti the Romish press, in which the most open di are mingled with threats of persecution. If obtain the ascendancy, what would be the res passage, cited from the "Rambler," tells themselves look to.

“ You ask, if I were lord in the land, and you were in a minority, if not in numbers, yet in power, what would we do to you? That we say would entirely depend on circumstances. If it would benefit the cause of Catholicism, we would tolerate you; if expedient we would imprison you, banish, fine you; possibly we might even hang you. But be assured of one thing, we would never tolerate you for the sake of the glorious principle of Civil and Religious Liberty.”—p. 433.

The Romish priesthood in Ireland and their parliamentary satellites have recently commenced a crusade against the Established Church on the principle of Religious Liberty and Equality, and are looking for the aid of the leading friends of those principles. Their own practical views on the subject are exhibited in attempts to murder the Scripture readers and missionaries, or to deter them by force from the prosecution of their work. The theory of their Church is thus stated by the “ Rambler :”—

“ It is difficult to say in which of the two popular expressions—‘ the rights of *civil* liberty,’ or, ‘ the rights of religious liberty ’—is embodied the greatest amount of nonsense and falsehood. As these phrases are perpetually uttered by Protestants, and by some Catholics, they contain about as much truth and good sense as would be found in a cry for the inalienable right of suicide. * * * *

“ Let this pass, then, in the case of Protestants and politicians. But how can it be justified in the case of Catholics, who are the children of a Church which has ever avowed the deepest hostility to the *principle* of ‘ religious liberty,’ and which has never given the shadow of a sanction to the theory that ‘ civil liberty,’ as such, is *necessarily* a blessing at all? How intolerable it is to see this miserable device for deceiving the Protestant world still so widely popular amongst us! We say, ‘ for *deceiving* the Protestant world,’ though we are far enough from implying that there is not many a Catholic who really imagines himself to be a votary of ‘ *religious liberty*,’ and is confident that if the tables were turned, and the Catholics were uppermost in the land, he would, *in all circumstances*, grant others the same unlimited toleration he now demands for himself. * * * *

“ Believe us not, Protestants of England and Ireland, for an instant, when you see us pouring forth our liberalisms. When you hear a Catholic orator at some public assemblage declaring solemnly that ‘ this is the most humiliating day in his life, when he is called upon to defend once more the glorious principle of *religious freedom* ’—(especially if he says any thing about the Emancipation Act, and the ‘ toleration ’ it *conceded* to Catholics)—be not too simple in your credulity. These are brave words, but they mean nothing; no, nothing more than the promises of a parliamentary candidate to his constituents on the hustings.”—pp. 432, 433.

Statements like this ought to be preserved; and the volume before us contains a useful collection of specimens.

xxix.—*A First History of Greece. By the Author of "Amy Herbert," &c.* London: Longmans. 1852.

THIS delightful book fully keeps up the already high reputation of the authoress: it is beautifully written as to style, tone, and temper; and is in every way admirably adapted for the delight and instruction of the young.

xxx.—*Sermons to Children, preached in St. Stephen's Church, Brighton. By the Rev. GEORGE WAGNER, M.A.* Brighton: Henry S. King. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1852.

It always gives us especial pleasure when we are enabled to bestow cordial commendation on the productions of those, who, though, in some degree, separated from ourselves, are still one with us in their honest endeavour to proclaim the truth as it is in Jesus, without partiality, and without hypocrisy. The little volume before us is just one of those which we can dwell upon with unmingled satisfaction. It is impossible for any one practised on the subject to read two pages of it without perceiving that the writer is what is termed "Evangelical;" and yet a much shorter consideration will prove to us, beyond doubt, that he is a sincere Christian, whilst a longer examination elicits the conclusion, that he has said nothing in the volume inconsistent with the Catholic faith. We like, nay, we *love*, such books. There are, indeed, some passages which *we* should have written differently; and yet herein lies the charm,—that though such be the case, we can cordially sympathize with the author throughout. It is a habit with some persons in their abhorrence of latitudinarianism, to confine their own devotional reading, and that of their children, to those works which exactly agree with their own tastes and fancies, as well as principles and sympathies in *phraseology*, as well as thought; and where such identity cannot be obtained, it is too much the custom of these individuals, and they are many in number, to use and recommend extreme and decidedly objectionable books, which lean in what they think the right direction, instead of the very best books, which are only just at the other side of the line of demarcation, which party feeling has laid down in their bosoms. Now this is very foolish, and very wrong; it tends to weaken and narrow the mind and the heart, to chain both down to the slavery of words and phrases, and to offer to party that loyalty and love which belong of right to God, and God only.

We, therefore, most heartily commend this very beautiful, simple, and holy little book—not only in spite of, but also on account of its being written by one who "followeth not with

us"—we advise those who symbolize with us to circulate it amongst their little friends; and we earnestly wish the author God speed in feeding the lambs of Christ.

XXXI.—1. *Holy Baptism: selected from the Tracts for Parochial use.*

2. *Confirmation; or Tracts for the use of Persons about to be Confirmed.*

3. *Words of Advice and Warning.*

4. *The Chief Truths.*

5. *A Scripture Catechism on the Church, wherein the Answers are given in the Words of the Bible.*

6. *The Church Service.* Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1852.

WE rejoice to see and to recommend these well-arranged selections from Mr. Parker's Parochial Tracts—a series for which he deserves well at the hands of Churchmen. The success which has attended this publication, and the interest which the publisher is generally believed to have taken in it, afford one more proof of the great advantage derivable to the clergy from the active co-operation, and sound practical sense of loyal and intelligent laymen.

The tracts on Baptism are sound in principle and sober in tone, whilst they are exceedingly simple and intelligible. Those on Confirmation fill a void which must have been painfully felt by every pastor. Words of Advice and Warning are extremely valuable, we should perhaps give them the palm. The brochure on The Chief Truths is plain and straightforward; but might, we think, have been written more simply and effectively. The Scripture Catechism on the Church, is an admirable handbook, which no teacher, lay or clerical, should be without. The Tracts on The Church Service contain much that is good, and nothing that is objectionable; but they are not altogether on the whole quite equal to the rest of the series in practical usefulness. We should advise their being kept in their separate form.

XXXII.—1. *The Ten Commandments.*

2. *The Lord's Supper.*

3. *Tracts for Penitents.* John Henry Parker: Oxford and London. 1852.

WE have separated these from their companions because we have more or less fault to find with all of them.

We consider the author of the tracts on the first and second

commandments to be guilty of grave neglect or grievous sin in making no mention of, or allusion to, the idolatries of Rome, and the temptations now existing to fall into those idolatries. The tracts state nothing whatever that is objectionable, but they fail to state what they ought to state, and ought not therefore to be circulated without some dissuasive from Rome to go with them. The other commandments are admirably handled.

The tracts on the Lord's Supper are sound and practical: but we think that the last of them had much better be omitted, as it is decidedly a blemish to the otherwise excellent collection. This is not a time, in our opinion, at least, to adopt in newly-compiled devotions for general use such titles as

An Act of Contrition.

An Act of Faith.

An Act of Love.

An Act of Desire.

It can do no good; and may do much harm. On the one hand, we are bound to do nothing which may unnecessarily wound weak consciences or awaken distrust; on the other, it is injudicious, to say the least of it, to use any indifferent phrase which has a tendency to throw down the barriers of distinction between truth and falsehood, right and wrong. The Prussian Government, in its jealousy of French invasion, has forbidden the French language to be learnt in its national schools: we have an equally imminent peril from an equally powerful and ambitious enemy, whose language even to the minutest phrase we should eschew with, *at least*, equal vigilance.

Our severest censure is however due to the author of the "Tracts for Female Penitents;" since, whatever be the measures of love and holiness with which they abound, they manifestly have a tendency to encourage the system of *spiritual direction*, against which we have felt it our painful duty to enter our most solemn protest. Nevertheless, as far as the tracts themselves are concerned, if rightly used by either priest or penitent, they would be most serviceable; nor should we have found any fault with them, but for our unhappy consciousness of the active operation and baneful effects of the erroneous system to which we have alluded.

XXXIII.—*Thoughts in Past Years. By the Author of "The Cathedral."* Sixth Edition. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 377, Strand, London. MDCCCLII.

WE are glad to see another edition of this very beautiful and justly popular collection.

"Some classical subjects," the author informs us, "which appeared in the earlier editions, have been now omitted, and placed in the other volume, 'The Christian Scholar,' as more suitable to it. The part called 'the Side of the Hill,' is composed of poems not before published."—p. vii.

Among these new contributions, the lines on the "Origin of the Tracts for the Times" will be read with considerable interest ; as well as several others connected with the movement, and its results.

The following purely domestic piece strikes us as deserving the highest praise, both in a moral and poetic point of view :—

"Whate'er thou dost, my growing boy,
With doubtful sins ne'er stop to toy ;
As thou wouldst keep the open glance
Of a truthful countenance,—
As thou wouldst love a conscience pure,
And peace which may through life endure,
Thou must not dare with aught to play
Which fain would shun the eye of day,
Ne'er for one moment pause within
The precincts of a question'd sin,
Nor harbour aught that dwells from sight,
In twilight between wrong and right.
In the warm evening of the spring
The foulest things are on the wing,
And doubtful shapes, half-bird, half-brute,
Like evil spirits in pursuit."—p. 309.

We must find room for one more extract, an exquisite little piece, entitled

THE SILKWORM.

"I cannot now this habit leave,
It is my nature thus to weave ;
Upon the verdant leaf I feed ;
Then from within these webs proceed.
It may keep warm my wintry bed,
My winding-sheet when I am dead.
I hope from such myself to spring,
And, when I leave them on the wing,
Others may profit find in these,
And cherish them, if God so please.
But be it so, or all in vain
I cannot cease this pleasing pain."—p. 326.

xxxiv.—1. *La Filosofia delle Scuole Italiane. Lettere al professore G. M. Bertini per* AUSONIO FRANCHI. Capolago : Tipografia Elvetica. 1852.

2. *The Philosophy of the Italian Schools. Letters to Professor G. M. Bertini by* AUSONIO FRANCHI. Capolago : Helvetian Press. 1852.

SUCH is the title of a work lately offered to the Italian public. It professes to be written and published in Switzerland, the Introduction being dated from Geneva. The newspapers have mentioned a certain Buonavino, an Italian priest of respectability and learning, as the author, and it is said that the Piedmontese Government are trying to gain judicial evidence of the fact, in order that he may be brought to trial on account of the opinions he has put forth. We invite attention to this book, since it not only appears likely to have influence in Italy, but also indicates the present state of feeling there. It is a symptom of the struggle which has long been carried on, and is now apparently approaching a crisis in that unhappy land—the struggle, namely, between Superstition and Infidelity.

No one who has, even superficially, observed the present state, religious, moral, and political of Italy, can doubt that it is on the eve of a great change; things cannot continue as they are; the past history of mankind proves, that *thought* cannot for ever be repressed by physical force, that when a national system, which no longer retains its hold on the faith and intelligence of a people, is supported mainly or solely by persecution, and by an appeal to the lower instincts of man's nature, such a system must at last be thrown off. The emancipation may take place sooner or later, according to the resources and consequent force of resistance of the ruling powers; still it is only a question of time, and it therefore becomes a subject of deep interest to observe the tendencies of the innovating movement; not only to examine the evils of the obnoxious system, but also the probable character of that which is to supplant it. If many among us fear the progress of infidelity in this country, where we have the blessing of a Scriptural as well as Apostolic Church, and a clergy in no respects inferior to their opponents even in secular learning, and, as a body, claiming general respect by their social and moral conduct as Christian men, what is the prospect for Italy; where, on the side of religion, there is—the Papacy, the symbol of national degradation, upheld as it is solely by foreign arms—the court of Rome, synonymous to the ears of an Italian with corruption and iniquity—an ignorant and immoral priesthood, accused on all hands of trafficking with the consciences and terrors of men, and gaining their

subsistence by preaching a Heaven, a Hell, and a Purgatory, which they themselves disbelieve—and in fine pervading the whole like a subtle essence—the principle of Jesuitism. It is true, indeed, that in Italy we find a Church, originally founded by the Apostles, and cemented by the blood of saints and martyrs, to whose care was entrusted the Divine revelation of God to man in the Written Word, and through whose medium the Sacraments of His grace are perpetually dispensed. But in what estimation does she hold these high privileges? Does she look upon them as a sacred deposit, to be protected with reverent and jealous care from all human additions, as well as diminutions? What are the facts? We find God's word a sealed book to the people, who, instead of being exhorted to the daily contemplation of the life and discourses of their Divine Master, are invited to meditate on the lives and miracles of the saints; are taught, indeed, that it is as necessary to their salvation to receive and believe such miracles, as those which we accept on the authority of inspiration.

The dogmas of the infallibility of the Pope, of Indulgences and of Purgatory, are put forth as equally binding with a belief in the Holy Trinity, or in the efficacy of the Atonement; indeed, so indissolubly united are human corruptions with the truths of revelation in the Roman Church, that she scruples not to declare, that her members must receive her as she is, or reject all Divine revelation, for her language is “on my authority alone you can receive the Bible; and I alone have determined for you as to the authenticity of its contents.”

The author of the work before us is, apparently, a striking instance of the *practical* results of the Church system in Italy; himself a priest, he not only denounces the corrupt practices of his Church, but aims a blow at Christianity, and rejects all Divine revelation. Nor is he a man, who, from irregular conduct, has fallen under ecclesiastical censure, and is now endeavouring to avenge himself on a system which has rejected him; on the contrary, he was living in esteem and competency, in the midst of the state of things which he denounces, and he has, by this act deprived himself of all means of support, and incurred the risk of condemnation to the galleys. Here then is the miserable spectacle of a Christian priest, abjuring his faith, and turning all the powers of his intellect against that God, whose cause he has sworn to uphold; but while we feel just indignation, let us not underrate the strength of the temptation to which he has been exposed. Who, that has not experienced it, shall estimate the power, with which doubts assail a man of vigorous mind, practically conversant with no other system than that of the Romish

Church, exemplified by its moral and political results in Italy! Surely as Heathen Rome was stained with the blood of martyrs, so Papal Rome will one day hear the accusing cry of thousands, cast into the abyss of scepticism, from horror of her corruptions and tyranny. Let us, therefore, while we cannot but condemn the principles of this unhappy man, not refuse him our compassion, nor withhold from him the acknowledgment of a certain generosity of character and sincerity of purpose.

We will begin our extracts with the account which the author, at page 88 of the introduction, gives us of himself, and of the means by which he has arrived at his present conclusions, merely observing that if seen through the medium of a translation, his expressions may sometimes appear exaggerated; read in the original, and with the remembrance that they are the words of an Italian, we are impressed with the conviction that they come from the heart:—

“The opinions which I now profess, are not those in which I was educated; therefore they can neither be attributed to the force of habit, nor to the effect of prejudice. My boyhood and youth were passed under the discipline of the college and seminary, where I proved myself not only a docile, but a scrupulously devout and affectionate pupil. My scanty studies in literature, philosophy, and theology never extended beyond the strict and jealous circle of Roman orthodoxy; my favourite teachers were the *saints*, and chiefly Thomas Aquinas and Alphonso de' Liguori. The two ruling passions of this period of my life were study and devotion; and until my twenty-third year, in which I was ordained priest, I had no other occupation, I tasted no other pleasures than those of reading and prayer. In a word, had it not been for the firmness of a most affectionate father, I should have entered, as I had already resolved, into the society of the Jesuits, an institution, which seemed to me most adapted to satisfy, both my thirst for knowledge, and my zeal to labour as a missionary in the service of God. Thus the spring-tide of my life knew no other joys than those of sacrifice and terror, experienced no other delights than those of prayer and penitence. When I now look back on those years, at once so sad and yet so joyful; years, which for me were gladdened by no smile, over which the poetry of youth cast not one flower, nor excited one throb. Ah! I do indeed feel my soul shrink from the recollection of that state of febrile exaltation, with which a mystical fanaticism had enamoured me, but it shrinks as from the remembrance of a misfortune and with no feeling of remorse. Faith had hitherto preserved in me, all the simplicity, candour, and trustfulness of childhood; and he only who has experienced it, can understand the mysterious condition of that man, whose conscience is misled by his very virtue, who from fervour of piety abjures reason, and from love to God willingly raves (*delira*). But the priesthood was for me, the dawn of a new existence; and the first ray of light darted on

my mind, incredible as it may appear, from the Confessional.—At my soul's first contact with the realities of human life, at that tale of misery and sorrow, which the men and women of the people came trembling and weeping to deposit in my breast; I began to feel an opposition between the moral doctrines of the schools and the inward voice of conscience. Thus was I first assailed by doubts. To tranquillize my mind therefore, I recommenced the study and examination of those theological principles, which I had always considered as eternal and absolute truths. Then for the first time, I perceived that my studies had been directed, not by the spirit of truth, but by that of sectarianism, and that, at the very time when I thought they were finished, it was necessary to begin them again. I did not hesitate for an instant. A new world, still in confusion, was opening before me; and a secret presentiment warned me, that after questions on Jesuitical morality, others were arising, still graver and more important, and that, under casuistical difficulties, lay concealed the whole system of religion, of science, of society, and of life. Still I did not hesitate. As if by instinct, I saw, that the path on which I was entering, was not one that would lead either to honours or emoluments; and without loss of time, I willingly gave up those I already enjoyed; and resolved to continue in a private and independent position, a resolution in which I have ever persevered, often resisting the entreaties of friends, and the smiles of fortune, and in order to dedicate myself to the search after, and worship of truth, I resigned myself beforehand to an obscure, laborious, and necessitous life, and stopped short in the honourable and lucrative career which was opening before me.

“ I now therefore recommenced my course of study, and from morality I had soon to pass to dogmatism, thence to history, and so on to literature, education, philosophy, and politics. This work, which produced a deep and ineffaceable revolution in my whole being, was at first a fierce struggle, against myself, against the belief imbibed at my mother's breast, and received from honoured lips, against the instructions of my youth, the anathemas of the Church, the sophisms of self-love, and the seductions of fear; a struggle which cost my heart tears of blood, but which that heart undertook, maintained and won in its own strength, and in the secret recesses of conscience, with no witness, counsellor, or judge but God; a struggle which day by day, and one by one, stripped from the soul those convictions, which I had hitherto professed, with all the enthusiasm of a pure and unsullied faith, to which I had consecrated with a vow, the flower of my youth, in which I had placed the dearest pleasures, the noblest aspirations, the sweetest hopes of my life. After having examined the doctrines of the different Catholic schools, I turned to the principles of the Jansenists, then I consulted the Protestant systems, questioned the philosophy of the last century, weighed the modern works of criticism relating to religious creeds; and the first certain, unshaken, and incontrovertible conclusion, in which my mind found rest was this, that reason is the supreme judge of all truth. Having established this principle, my intellectual and moral eman-

cipation was complete. It led immediately to the denial of every supernatural dispensation, of all positive theology, of all theocratical authority, of all divine revelation, it discovered to me the universal law of continual progress, and of successive transformation, which directs the physical and moral life of the world, of beings and of ideas, of nature and of science, of civilization and of religion; and hence arose that harmony between the intellect and the heart, which I had in vain sought in every other system."

It is not our intention to enter into an examination, or attempt a confutation, of the principles this writer propounds, our only aim being to call attention to those passages which throw light on the present state and tendencies of Italy, and which occur in the lengthy introduction to his work. He apparently accepts, in their extreme results, the doctrines of Kant, and of other German and French metaphysicians, and puts forth his views in an animated and popular manner. The minds of those he addresses are, unhappily, but too well prepared to receive such teaching; and when to this fact is added the *prestige* which persecution and the excommunication of his book will lend to the author, there can be little doubt that the work before us will have much more influence in Italy than a similar publication would have in this country.

He begins by assuming that—

"To estimate correctly the state of a nation, it is necessary to determine in what condition are its philosophy and its religion, since the state of its philosophy will show what is the extent, the power, and the energy of its intellect; while from its religion may be inferred the rectitude, the warmth, and the magnitude of its heart."

He then asks "Whether modern philosophy be still possible in Italy?" and answers in the negative, from the fact that philosophy cannot exist where there is no liberty.

"Now, up to the present time, what liberty has Italy enjoyed? The press is subject to the censure of the bishops and the government; a jealous system of *espionage* is kept up in the sanctuary of home; the public schools are regulated by official programmes; private teaching is either forbidden or subjected to severe restrictions; academical meetings are either entirely proscribed, or the members are condemned to make verses without poetry, speeches without ideas, and disputations without practical aim. The libraries are either closed, or no work is admitted which is placed on the index of prohibited books. There is no liberty of conscience, no religious toleration: there are no studies in common with other countries. Foreign books and journals which are not approved by the authorities, are either seized or sent out of the country; and persecution, imprisonment, and exile, await those who dare transgress any of the numerous regulations, issued by the autho-

rities, high or low, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, who are employed to measure out to Italians air, light, and warmth, sufficient for vegetation, and whose business it is to preserve them from all temptation to think, speak, or write, things hurtful to the health of their souls."

He then gives examples of the persecutions and sufferings of different Italian philosophers¹; and after stating that the professorships are almost exclusively filled by ecclesiastics, he exclaims—

"What philosophy can be expected from such professors? That, and that only, which has been reviewed, corrected, and approved by legitimate superiors,—that is to say, by the Bishops and the Pope. What terms can be more opposed and contradictory to each other than 'Pope' and 'Philosophy?' Philosophy is reason,—the Pope is authority: philosophy is liberty of examination,—the Pope, blind faith; philosophy, the progress of science;—the Pope, the *vis inertiae* of ignorance. Philosophy, the echo of nature; the Pope, the oracle of revelation. Hence philosophy is the denial of the Pope, as the Pope is the denial of philosophy. Thus clerical teaching has been that which it ought to be,—a crusade against philosophy,—which has come to be represented as the origin and primary cause of every evil, and of all the errors which afflict and dishonour the human race. From it are said to proceed political changes, and civil disorders, insubordination of nations, and the fall of states, corruption of manners, and contempt of law, hatred of religion, loss of faith, and all the miseries of a present and future life. Thus philosophy, in the hands of the clergy, could serve no other purpose than to prove the impotence and folly of reason; and, in their language, the name of philosopher had become synonymous with that of impious man or a fool."

Nor does he think the state of private education much better, although here he says—

"We may find somewhat less ignorance and fanaticism, and a little more learning, criticism, and good faith; still every where, as regards philosophy, the barbarous language of the schoolmen continues to be spoken, and the atmosphere of the middle ages breathed."

¹ It is here significant to observe that two of the number, Rosmini and Gioberti, who stood forward as champions of the Romish Church, and of the supremacy of the Pope, were driven into exile, and their works placed on the Index, because they ventured to lament certain abuses, and advocated the revival of primitive discipline. The Italian scholar would find much to interest him in "*Le cinque piaghe della Santa Chiesa*," by Rosmini. It is written in a temperate and reverent manner by a Roman Catholic priest, and is dedicated to the clergy. It is much to be regretted that such works are so little known in England, giving us, as they do, far more trustworthy evidence of the abuses and disunion in the Romish Church, than that which we gain from the invectives of a Gavazzi or an Achilli. To those who are scandalized at the mode in which English bishops are appointed, we would recommend the fourth chapter of the "*Piaghe*," which treats "*of the nomination of the bishops abandoned to the secular authority*," or the third, "*on the disunion of the bishops*."

After giving his views on the state of the philosophical element the writer proceeds to the religious, and in confirmation of his principle, that the Christian religion is subject to the same law of rise, progress, and decay, which has influenced all *human* institutions, he continues:—

“ And even that religion, which once appeared better provided with titles, and richer in documents, so that it seemed capable of belying history, is now so different from what it was, that certainly neither Christ nor Peter would recognize their own work. We see it reduced to such extremity, that all means fail to keep together the few who remain faithful to it; we see it prolong a feeble existence under the protection of a few soldiers, who curse it—of a few princes, who insult it—of a few orators, who detest it—and of a few writers, who have never either known or professed it; we see it obliged to confess that its kingdom is the silence of the desert: its science is ignorance; its school is the cemetery; its apostles are the Jesuits; its arguments are imprisonment, exile, torture, and the scaffold. But a religion, which rose with the Gospel of Christ, was nourished with the blood of martyrs, and enlightened by the wisdom of the Fathers, yet which afterwards speedily became corrupted by ambition, avarice, licentiousness, violence, and barbarity, and at length sank so low as to call the Court of Rome the Holy Church, the Inquisition a Catholic institution, and the word of Pius IX. the Oracle of the Holy Ghost—such a religion may appear divine and celestial to those few privileged souls who are satisfied to think with the mind of others, and do not care to understand what they say; but to all those who value reason, and respect history, it will not certainly appear of a nature so far superior to others, that it requires the direct and immediate intervention of God, or can be exempt from the natural and organic laws of the human mind.”

He then proceeds to show that the Church has lost her hold on the hearts of the people.

“ Our country is condemned and forced to profess a religion in which it no longer believes, and therefore the conscience is prostituted to a ritual, for which it has no longer either reverence or love. We live under the authority of *the religion of the State*, and the only religion of the State is Catholicism. . . . Now, as to the sentiments with which Italy regards the doctrines and practices of this religion, the last four years have shown so clearly, that there can be no longer doubt or illusion on the subject. Listen to the clergy; their discourses are constantly on the sad times, the perversity of men's minds, the increase of infidelity, the evils and wounds of the Church. From the encyclicals of the Pope to the sermons of the parish priest; from the pastoral charges of the bishops to the discourses of missionaries; from conferences in the sacristy to articles in the papers, the clergy do nothing but deplore the misfortunes of Italy, because the Catholic faith languishes, and impiety is universal. And they are right; daily and

important facts justify their lamentations. Wherever the expression of thought and of conscience was, or is, free, there open war is waged against the Pope and the bishops—against rites, mysteries—in a word, against Catholicism; there books and periodicals, coteries and societies, theatres and other public places, show forth the principles of a rational faith diametrically opposed to the orthodox. And where the voice of public opinion is stifled, if the press is silent, not so are actions; and actions, with mute but energetic eloquence, do indeed attest that the people of Italy are Catholic only in name, and that if, individually, many remain faithful to the Pope, it cannot be said that the majority of the nation do so.”

Of this he cites two recent examples, Piedmont and Rome. In the former country—

“When the Government resolved to abolish certain ecclesiastical privileges by a law, to which Rome strongly opposed herself, what occurred? Spectacle both new and unexpected! On one side was the Church—that is, Pope, bishops, canons, rectors, priests, and monks, of all parties, who, in the name of God, and of the Catholic religion, condemned the law, and threatened with anathema all its promoters; on the other side, the whole country, which laughed at the sophisms of the Pope, despised the complaints of the clergy, applauded the Government, celebrated the decree as a national benefit, and now consecrates its memory with a monument.” (To Siccardi, the minister, whose statue is now in the course of erection at Turin.)

“The other example is still more important; it comes to us from Rome itself! The Roman people heard, one day, of the flight of Pius IX., and were unconcerned; they heard the thunders of excommunication hurled against the framers of another Government, and they ran in crowds to elect their representatives, and threw into the Tiber the copies of the Papal sentence; they heard the fall of the Pontiff, and the foundation of the Republic, proclaimed from the Campidoglio, and with a shout of exultation, and a hymn of liberty, they replied to the vote of the Assembly; they heard of the approach of four armies, under the Papal banners, and they flew to arms, resisted, fought, and died, to drive away the ‘Vicar of Christ;’ while the rest of Italy admired and blessed them, calling them heroes and martyrs. Now, ought these people, who celebrate with enthusiasm that which the Church formally reprobates, still to call themselves Catholic?

“It is in vain to elude the force of these facts by objecting that they were questions of civil rights, which did not touch the spiritual constitution of the Church, since the Pope maintained the contrary, the bishops unanimously echoed the Pope, and when the Episcopate with the Pope at their head, pronounce a doctrinal judgment, this judgment is, for every Catholic, truth, and the voice of the Holy Ghost, and to deny it is apostasy. Were they even points of discipline relating to no dogma, it would come to the same thing—the Church or the Pope commanded, the people would not obey, and to refuse obedience to the

Pope or to the Church, is apostasy. . . . The practical consequence of this state of things is too evident; Italy has no longer a national religion, very many have renounced all religion, and that external form which many still profess, is for the majority, mechanical, or an affair of habit or dissimulation or a pastime (*passo tempo*), only in very few is it accompanied with a feeling of Christian piety. . . . No, the Church of Christ no longer exists: it is history, not I who proclaim it. Examine the civilized countries of Europe, and name the nations in which public morality is least respected, probity least severe, honesty least to be depended on, love least noble, promises least sacred, virtue least pure! They are Catholic. And among the Catholics themselves which is the class that, in general, least recommends itself by sanctity of manners, nobleness of character, greatness of soul, generosity of sentiment, constancy of sacrifices, love of country, zeal for justice, reverence for truth? It is the clergy. And among the clergy themselves, who is the real and living personification of all these scandals? It is the Pope. He is the vicar of Christ, and a king,—the father of the faithful, and a tyrant,—the successor of Peter, and the ruler of a state,—the apostle of the Gospel, and the captain of armies—a preacher of humility, poverty, gentleness, penitence, and exposed to the adoration of the world, surrounded by police (*birri*) and executioners, and in the midst of luxury, pleasure, and bloodshed. And does this man call himself the representative of God? Do these clergy boast themselves successors of the Apostles? And would they impose their ideas on mankind as the oracles of the Holy Ghost? No, their religion cannot be ours! No, their God cannot be He who lives in the hearts of men! No, their Church cannot be the family of Christ! They have made of religion a political sect, of God a monster, of the Church a secret society Oh! in proportion as I admire the heroism of the primitive clergy, who showed their zeal for the cause of Christ, by martyrdom; so do I detest the unworthiness of those of our own day, who presume to exercise their apostleship by making martyrs of those who do not believe them. I venerate the martyr, but I loathe the executioner. I kiss the foot of the apostle, but I execrate the inquisitor; I bless the soft and persuasive voice of truth, but I despise the threatening and fanatic cry of violence; I recognize the person of Christ, in the humble, meek, and generous priest, who consecrates his life to evangelizing and comforting his brethren, but I only see the infamous type of the Pharisee, in the proud, avaricious, and cruel prelate, who spends his life in trampling on and cursing his fellow-men; I adore the faith which regenerated the pagan world, and began a new epoch for humanity, but I abhor the faith, which has deluged the earth with the blood of religious wars."

After having thus proved, at least to his own satisfaction, that Italy is no longer Catholic, he will not admit that it is therefore disposed to become Protestant, and small encouragement indeed does he give to the efforts of our Bible and Missionary Societies.

“ There are not wanting those who would hand over Italy to some one of the many Protestant Churches, but I am confident that the good sense of the Italians, will lead them to a better judgment, both of the present times and institutions. The Reformation, which in the sixteenth century was a great progress, now would be but a useless anachronism. . . . Our ancestors did not embrace Protestantism when it was living, robust, and full of future promise ; and ought we to accept it now that it is only a name, a formality, a memory of the past ? ”

That a rationalistic writer should speak in these terms, can excite no surprise ; but when we reflect that these are also the sentiments of a large and growing class, we must confess that the future religious prospects of Italy are sufficiently gloomy. While among men of education and thought, prevails either scepticism or indifferentism, the lower classes are sunk in the grossest ignorance and superstition. The clergy, in the mean time, are doing all in their power to stifle inquiry, and impede the education of the people, and those priests who remonstrate, however temperately, against the abuses and lax discipline of their Church, are repudiated and exiled. The efforts towards proselytism on the part of Protestants, are jealously watched by government, and repressed by actual persecution. Facts, however, sufficiently prove that the Italian mind is accessible to the voice of Truth ; and we do not see why faith should not spread, notwithstanding the persecutions directed against it.

But it is time to bring these extracts and observations to a close.

That the author, as an Italian priest, must have had good means both of becoming acquainted with the working of his Church system, and with the state of religious feeling among his countrymen, is as evident, as that he is likely to give us his impressions, somewhat highly coloured. We leave them therefore to speak for themselves, as also the significant fact, of such a book proceeding from such a quarter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Amongst the publications now before us to which we can on this occasion afford only a transient notice, are “ A Narrative of a Visit to Lew-Chew by the Bishop of Victoria ” (Hatchard), an extremely interesting publication ; “ The Six Days,” by Captain Charles Knox (Hatchard), bringing geology to the illustration of the Bible ; “ The Gospel Missionary for 1852 ” (Bell), an admirable periodical, which every one ought to subscribe for ; the second edition of Mr. Vanderkiste’s most interesting “ Notes and Narratives ” of his labours in the London City Mission (Nisbet) ; “ Revealed Economy of Heaven and Earth ” (Boa-

worth), a very thoughtful work on the design of the Gospel and the future condition of Christianity; "The American Pulpit" (Clark), containing sermons by many of the most distinguished American divines; "The Mission and Martyrdom of St. Peter," by T. Collins Simon (Seeleys), a critical examination of the evidence for St. Peter's having visited Rome; "Course of the History of Modern Philosophy," by M. Cousin, translated by Mr. Wright (Clark), an American translation of Cousin's celebrated work, which appears to be carefully executed. We have also to notice as deserving of attention, "A Charge" by the Ven. C. Clerke, D.D., Archdeacon of Oxford; "A Sermon on the Proposal to Open the Crystal Palace on the Lord's Day," by the Rev. J. E. Kempe; "A Sermon on Church Music," by W. Gresley, Prebendary of Lichfield; "A Charge on Convocation," by Archdeacon Bartholomew; "A Sermon on the Common Prayer," by the Rev. J. P. Marriott; "A Dirge for Wellington," by M. F. Tupper; "A Reply to the Strictures of Lord Mahon on the Life of Washington," by Jared Sparks; "Lectures on the Principles of Action in the Conduct of Life," by R. Snape; Rev. S. N. Pears on "The Protestant Theory of Church Music;" "The Worthy Communicant," by the Rev. H. Goodwin; "Phaethon," by the Rev. C. Kingsley; Shepherd's "Letter to the Rev. S. R. Maitland, on St. Cyprian's Works;" "Sermons on the Death of the Duke of Wellington," by the Revs. E. Miller, H. Howarth, J. Baines, N. Tate, G. Currey, and also by the Rev. J. Sortain, and T. Binney, dissenting ministers.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

EUROPE.

BELGIUM.—The following communication, which has lately appeared, relates an interesting fact, showing the progress and the power of the Gospel in Belgium :—

“ Heigne, September 10, 1852.

“ . . . Since last autumn, meetings have been held by me on Sunday evenings at Houbois, a distant hamlet of this extensive commune, and have been very numerously attended. Hundreds of Roman Catholics have come to hear the Word of Life, and their conduct has been invariably orderly and peaceable. This is the more remarkable, as the neighbourhood is full of public-houses, and in all directions on Sunday evenings the songs of the drunkard and the noise of music and dancing may be heard. The priests have never publicly discountenanced these things; but as soon as they heard of our meetings they made a great outcry. The preaching of the Word of God, the hymns, the pious accents of prayer, were denounced as a curse. ‘The curse has entered this village,’ said one of the priests in his sermon, ‘it will not be long before this place becomes the object of Divine vengeance.’ The priests visited the people, using threats and bribes, but in vain. Filled with rage, they determined to put an end to them, whatever it might cost. Six or seven of the men who have received the Gospel are employed in a coal-pit, of which the managing director is a main prop of the tyranny and idolatrous superstitions of the Church of Rome. A report was soon spread amongst the workmen that the priest had written to the director requesting him to expel from the works all the Protestants. Some days after this, our friend, at whose house the meetings are held, was sent for by the director, who begged of him to forsake our assembly and give up the Gospel, and endeavoured to persuade him that Protestants are revolutionists and disturbers of the public peace, bad characters, and the dregs of the people. Our friend answered, ‘Protestants are peaceable men, who pray for their king and country, and spend their Sabbaths in places of worship.’ ‘Had I been a bad character,’ he added, ‘a drunkard, or had my house been a resort for evil company, the priest would not have written to you about me.’ He then gave two excellent tracts to the director, who promised to read them; and he also asked him to act towards him with justice and compassion. He has four children, and is the support of his aged father. A month passed, and the storm appeared to have blown over, when a man fell from the top to the bottom of the pit, and was dashed to pieces. At the funeral of this unfortunate man, the priest, contrary to his usual custom, addressed the assembled masters and workmen. ‘The shaft,’ said he, ‘is cursed, because it is filled with blasphemers, with Protestants. If means be not taken to expel them, other acci-

dents may be expected.' I would here observe, that the character of the Protestants is so well known among the workmen that, when a swearer is reformed, the remark is that he is becoming Protestant.

"At the beginning of last month the director issued an order to all the Protestants to return to mass, and withdraw their children from the Scriptural schools, under pain of immediate dismissal from the works. All but one nobly refused to submit. Their conduct was beheld with admiration by all. When the overseers were putting their orders into execution, one of them said to one of our people, 'Are you coming with us to-morrow?' 'Where to?' was the reply. 'To mass.' 'No, never; I would sooner die.' 'You are an honest man,' said the overseer, shaking hands with him—'I respect you.' When our friends were leaving the works, several workmen said to them, 'They are persecuting your brethren in France; your turn will soon come in Belgium; take care of yourselves.'

"A few Sundays ago the priest placed himself in ambush near the house where I got to preach, that he might intimidate those who came to hear me. 'Where are you going?' said he, to two of our friends, though he well knew. 'To hear the Word of God preached,' was their answer. 'Say rather the word of the devil,' he replied.

"The time chosen for dismissing our brethren was well selected, as at this season work is scarce, on account of the canals being stopped. God, however, watched over them, and almost immediately they found work, contrary to their expectations. God be praised! By their courage and faithfulness they have given fresh proof that we do not labour in vain, and that the work of grace has taken root in many hearts.

"We live, thank God, under a paternal and generous government, ever ready to protect us; but the mass of the people is still very intolerant and fanatical. In many places converts to the faith of the Gospel are treated like Pariahs; their sufferings are incessant.

"Yours, &c.,

"J. JACCARD, Minister of the Gospel."

FRANCE.—The recent elevation of the Emperor Napoleon III. to the French throne having been brought about with the aid of the Romish Church in France, the latter is at present in the highest favour, and obtains whatever favours it demands.

Two decrees published in the "Moniteur" grant 2,500,000 francs for a Cathedral at Marseilles, and 1,500,000 francs for a new wing to the Cathedral of Moulins.

Louis Napoleon has, on the request of Cardinal Donnet, promised a grant of 500,000f. for beautifying the front and principal entrance of the Cathedral of Bordeaux.

In all the churches of France the *Domine, salvum fac Imperatorem nostrum Napoleonem* is chanted, according to the form prescribed in 1804 by the Holy See.

The Minister of Public Instruction and Worship has addressed the following circular to the bishops:—

“ Monseigneur,—The French people have just placed the crown of the Emperor Napoleon on the head of a Prince whom Divine Providence has chosen to put an end to the misfortunes of the country. The Empire is re-established. In the supreme power Napoleon III. will find new force for assuring to religion the first principle of the grandeur of nations, the respect which is the inheritance of his family, and the glory of his government. The Church of France, always ready to associate itself with the wishes of the nation, will gladly return, I do not doubt, to the formula which, on the 8th Jan. 1804, the Cardinal Caprara, in the name of the Holy See, transmitted to the bishops. I am certain, Monseigneur, to respond to your sentiments, not less than to the intentions of his Imperial Majesty, in demanding from you that the words *Domine, salvum fac Imperatorem nostrum Napoleonem* shall be substituted for those which were until lately chanted at the conclusion of Divine Service. I also beg of you, Monseigneur, to be kind enough to order that, after the singing of that verse, the prayer equally consecrated shall be recited: *Quæsumus Omnipotens Deus, ut famulus tuus Imperator noster, qui tua miseratione suscepit regni gubernacula, etc.* I shall receive with gratitude, Monseigneur, the communication which you may be kind enough to make to me of the instructions you may give on this subject to the clergy of your diocese.—Receive, &c.

“ H. FORTOUL,

“ Minister of Public Instruction and Worship.”

The Archbishop of Paris has issued the following pastoral letter to the curés of his diocese:—

“ Monsieur le Curé,—The Empire has been proclaimed; the elect of the people takes the title of Emperor of the French by the grace of God and the national will. Never, in fact, was the finger of God more visible than in the events which brought about this great result. Never was the will of the nation expressed in a manner more authentic, more invariable, and more energetic. Louis Napoleon, prompted by the most noble inspirations, declares to-day on a most solemn occasion in the presence of God and of men, that he desires to found his reign on religion, justice, probity, and love for the suffering classes. Let us greet with gratitude such an oath. May it remain in heaven as in the heart of the nation! and may aid from on high descend abundantly on him who has hitherto shown himself so worthy of the great mission which he has received! You are to substitute, Monsieur le Curé, for the prayer now in use for the head of the state, the following one:—

‘ Domine, salvum fac Imperatorem nostrum Napoleonem;
Exaudi nos in die qua invocaverimus te.’

“ Receive, Monsieur le Curé, this new assurance of my most affectionate devotedness.

“ ✠ MARIE DOMINIQUE AUGUSTE,
Archbishop of Paris.”

The “Univers” gives the following return of the subscriptions in

favour of Dr. Newman :—Subscriptions collected in England, 175,000f. in Ireland, 20,000f.; in France, 50,000f. have been collected by the "Univers," besides 12,500f. collected in other quarters. This makes the total amount already collected in England, Ireland, and France nearly 260,000f. (10,400*l.* sterling.)

It is stated in the journals that the *danseuse* Cerito, having vowed a chalice to "Our Lady" in the event of her obtaining an engagement this year at the French Opera of Paris, has, on being re-engaged, presented to "Our Lady" a chalice of Gothic pattern, bearing on its foot an inscription setting forth the vow, and imploring a blessing on the future efforts of the dancer to please the admiring public.

During his stay at Nismes the President was waited upon by the Protestant pastors of the district, and the Pastor-President had afterwards a long private interview with Louis Napoleon, in the course of which, it is stated, he promised to the Protestants full protection of their rights, and authorized the Pastor-President in case of grievance to write not to the Ministers, but to himself directly.

GREECE.—On Sunday, the 26th ult., the consecration of the first Bishop of the independent Church of Greece, since the emancipation of that country, took place in the principal church of Athens, in accordance with the terms of the treaty recently entered into with the Metropolitan of Constantinople. The whole clergy of the town were present at the ceremony, which was performed with the utmost pomp. Two English clergymen were admitted into the Hieron, or sanctuary, along with the Greek priests. The Queen of Greece was also present, with the whole Court, and the diplomatic corps, and all the authorities, civil and military. After the ceremony the Queen offered her good wishes to the new Bishop, whose benediction was received by more than three thousand persons. The person chosen to occupy the first and principal of the eighteen Bishoprics to be filled up, that of Achaia, is Father Missael, who was sent to Constantinople to negotiate with the Patriarch and afterwards to Russia, to announce the treaty to the Emperor.

Another Bishop of the independent Greek Church has been consecrated at Athens, under the new arrangement, and appointed to the diocese of Acarnania. It appears that on the day of the consecration of the Metropolitan of Athens, the Queen sent for the newly-consecrated Bishop to the palace, and, after conferring upon him the Grand Cross of the Order of the Saviour, informed him that he should have at all times free entrance to herself or to the King without going through the usual formalities.

ITALY.—The deputation, consisting of the Earl of Roden, the Earl of Cavan, and Captain Trotter, the representatives of the English evangelical Christians, and the representatives of various other countries, who had proceeded to Florence to intercede in behalf of the Madias, having requested an interview with the Grand Duke through the Tuscan Minister, have received the following reply :—

" To the Right Hon. the Earl of Roden, Peer of England, at Florence.

" Florence, Oct. 25.

" MY LORD,—I have placed the letter signed by the persons whose names are associated with yours, and which was addressed to me under date the 24th of this present month, before my august Sovereign.

" His Imperial and Royal Highness appreciates the form under which this application is made, but he would certainly have repulsed any political pressure whatever; and the honourable diplomatic agents who reside at this court would equally have abstained from exercising it.

" The husband and wife Madiai, Tuscan subjects, have been condemned to six years of reclusion by the regular tribunals for the crime of spreading Protestantism, which, inasmuch as it attacks the religion of the state, is punished by our laws. Their punishment is merely an application of those laws, and their appeal for a revision of the process has been rejected by the Court of Cassation.

" His Imperial and Royal Highness while reserving to himself the exercise of his high prerogative in such a manner and at such a time as he may judge fitting, cannot accept any interposition in an affair which concerns the administration of justice in his state, and its operation upon his own subjects.

" My august Sovereign, taking cognizance of the benevolent sentiments which inspire your conduct, but convinced that he ought not to listen to any kind of intervention in this matter, orders me to make known to you, my Lord, that he regrets his inability to grant the audience desired by you and the other subscribers to the letter addressed to me.

" Receive, my Lord, for yourself and colleagues, the assurance of my high esteem.

" LE DUC DE CASIGLIANO."

A further communication with the Minister on the part of the deputation took place, in which they requested that he would lay before the Grand Duke an address, in which they set forth the object they had in view.

F. Madiai was withdrawn from the charge of the regular chaplain of the jail, and placed under the *surveillance* of a guard of Capuchin friars, whose instructions were to employ all the available resources of the Church, including both exhortations and discipline, to bring him back to the Romish faith. To prevent any interference with this process of conversion, the permission given to his friends to see him was restricted to a visit of once a month.

It is understood that Rosa Madiai was lately visited by the Grand Duchess Maria Ferdinanda, the stepmother of the Sovereign; and subsequently by the Archbishop of Lucca, Padre Guilio Arrigoni. Through both these personages Rosa Madiai was offered her liberty on condition of abjuring her errors. The failure of both attempts is felt as a great embarrassment.

The Jesuits have found another victim. M. Guarducci, a clerk in the bank of Messrs. Fenzi and Hall, has been arrested for the crime of

Protestantism. The arrest was effected at three o'clock in the morning, when his house was searched, and a copy of Diodati's Bible found on the premises. M. Guarducci is one of the five individuals who, at the commencement of these proceedings, were sentenced with Count Guicciardini to a year's imprisonment for reading together the 15th chapter of the Gospel of St. John, but whose imprisonment was commuted, through the prompt exertions and indignant remonstrances of Mr. Shiel into a year of exile. M. Guarducci passed the term of banishment in Piedmont, and then returned to Florence, renewing his engagements in the bank of Messrs. Fenzi and Co., by whom he is much esteemed. The fact of this arrest following immediately upon the decrees by which the punishment of death is revived for offence against religion, has given rise to the most serious apprehensions of his ultimate fate. His wife and children, from whom he has been thus suddenly torn, are in a state of cruel anxiety.

As persecution for religion always defeats its own end, Protestantism is rapidly increasing at Florence, and the Jesuits are every day more and more alarmed and exasperated at the growing spirit of revolt. Their first attempt to check it was the arrest of an Italian printer, for printing copies of the New Testament, an arrest which gave rapid circulation to a large edition—the police agents themselves realizing handsome profits by the surreptitious sale of the copies seized. The next step was to send Captain Pakenham out of the country, as the foreign enemy supposed to be engaged in sowing the tares.

This was followed by a police edict prohibiting Italians from attending the services of the Swiss Protestant Church. The edict being neglected, two Waldensian ministers, with Count Guicciardini and several of his friends, were expelled the state, the count only escaping imprisonment in a fortress situated in the pestilential marshes of the Maremma through the prompt and energetic interference of Mr. Shiel. A multitude of minor arrests succeeded, and among them that of the Madiari, who were kept in separate prisons for nine months without trial, until a charge could be concocted against them.

We remain in expectation of further and more rigorous measures to put a stop to the Protestant movement; the government is aware that the presence of the deputation has inspired the Protestants with renewed confidence in the ultimate triumph of their principles, and that an address expressive of this sentiment, emanating from a very numerous body, and thanking their Christian friends of different states for their exertions in favour of the Madiari, was placed in the hands of Lord Roden before his departure.

An account of a miraculous cure has been published under the hand and seal of the Archbishop of Pisa, said to have been wrought by "Our Lady of Carmel" on a young woman in a state of extreme disease and debility, on her paying a visit to the church during the octave of Mount Carmel, with the concurrence of her confessor, a monk of the convent attached to the Church.

Whilst an address to the Queen has been put into the hands of Mr. Walpole, soliciting Her Majesty's interference on behalf of the

Madiais, the Berlin "Spener's Gazette" states, that they were to be liberated on the 1st of December, in compliance with the intercession of the King of Prussia, through Count Arnim Blumberg.

The Bishop of Turin has suspended *a divinis*, a priest named Barrieo, who had moved in the municipal council the resolution in virtue of which the mortal remains of the late Abbé Gioberti were removed to Italy. On the same day (says the "Gazetta del Popolo") the King sent Barrieo the decoration of SS. Maurice and Lazarus.

The commission of the Piedmontese senate on the Civil Marriage Bill has presented its report, with the amendments it proposes. The articles which relate to the claims of the Church are the following:—The civil law of Piedmont only considers marriage in its relations with civil society, leaving the duties which religion imposes out of the question. A Christian cannot marry a person not belonging to a Christian creed. Ecclesiastics and persons of both sexes who have taken vows of celibacy cannot marry. A marriage contracted according to the rites of the Roman Catholic Church debars the parties from contracting marriage with other persons of a different creed. Roman Catholics shall be admitted formally to declare in the contract that they do not consent to the civil marriage, unless it be followed by the religious ceremony according to the Roman Catholic rite. In the case of such declaration the marriage shall be null and void, unless a certificate of the said religious ceremony having been performed be delivered to the civil officer within a fortnight after the civil celebration. The separation between married persons may be pronounced by the tribunals in case one of the parties refuse to consent to the celebration of the Catholic rite. All matters relating to the validity of civil marriages are under the cognizance of the civil tribunals, except the cases anterior to the promulgation of the new law.

The celebrated Abbé Gioberti, whose prominence in Italian politics during the years 1847 and 1848 will be remembered, has just died at Paris, at the age of forty-five, of a fit of apoplexy. Gioberti was for a time president of the council of the cabinet of Charles Albert, and in 1849 represented the present King of Sardinia at Paris.

The "Nouveau Patriote Savoisien" has the following curious story:—"The vicar of Boège has lately accustomed himself, to impose as a penance on the females of his flock, the obligation of coming to his chambers, where, after their backs are stripped, they receive a flagellation from the pastoral hand. There is no mistake about the fact, which has evoked a cry of indignation throughout the commune. More than thirty females are known to have submitted to this infliction; others have refused to endure the degradation. The last attempt of the priest failed. The vicar had in his chamber a female who was *enceinte*, whom, under the pretext of penance, he was desirous of flogging, and was about to proceed by force to carry out his purpose; but the woman being frightened, uttered loud cries, which brought the neighbours to her aid."

The Pope held a secret consistory on the 27th ult., in which he made several appointments. Twenty-seven bishops were named for different

sees, and the pall was conferred upon several archbishops, among the those of Dublin, Corfu, and Halifax.

The Pope has passed a decree of "Beatification of the venerable servant of God, F. Paul of the Cross, professed priest and founder of the congregation of the Discalced Clerks of the Most Holy Cross and Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ." The decree authorizes the exposition of his body and relics for the public veneration of the faithful and the recitation of his office and mass at his yearly festival.

The "Giornale di Roma" announces that the worship of the ancient image of the Virgin, worshipped under the title of Salute degli in firmi in the church of Santa Maria Maddalena, said to have belonged to Pius V., and to have spoken to him on several occasions, and announced to him the victory of Lepanto, which had fallen into neglect, has begun to flourish marvellously, the number of the faithful who flock to "the Mother of Salvation" being incalculable, and the extraordinary graces obtained by her intercession innumerable.

The celebrated preacher, Father Ventura, is so dangerously ill that the last sacraments have been administered to him.

A priest of the Greek Church having accompanied a funeral in habit and carrying the cross, at Malta, the Popish authorities have applied to the Governor, calling upon him to enforce the law requiring ecclesiastical rites and ceremonies of the Greek Church to be performed within the church or burial-ground, and prohibiting her priests from appearing in the streets in sacerdotal vestments of any sort.

SPAIN.—The Madrid correspondent of the "Morning Chronicle" writing on October 15th, says:—"Another long list of convents published, which are authorized to receive noviciates under the concordat, so as to complete the legal number of nuns which each convent is entitled to have, and which is twenty to thirty in most cases descending as low as eight, and ascending up to sixty. The present list contains the names of 133 convents, in the provinces of Palencia, Segovia, Seville, Tarragona, and Tortosa, and the total number of nuns which they may contain is 4168. The 'Nacion' observes that when the convents were suppressed in 1835, there were about 1700 nuns in them; whereas looking at those which have already been authorized to receive noviciates, and those that still remain to be suppressed, the total number will probably not be less than 4000."

SWEDEN.—We have to insert the following interesting communication from a Swedish correspondent:—

"It is a well known fact that Protestantism in Germany, whence it originally came to Sweden, dissolved the papistical government of the Church. Whereas the Bishop of Rome was Patriarch of the Western Church, the patriarchal order also came to an end with the protest against the Pope. This order had, however, through the claims of the Pope on the primacy of the Church, vanished from the mind of people in general so much that there was hardly any question about it; but rather because the connexion with the Greek Church was dissolved, the Pope was resolved to keep all or to lose all.

“ The bishops took the side of the Pope, and lost consequently all with him. The German Evangelical Lutheran Church abolished episcopacy, and—as it was necessary that reform should spring from some power—left to the temporal sovereigns to carry out the same, without any fixed principles having been laid down, for it was left to the discretion of the sovereigns.

“ In Sweden, King Gustavus I. was the principal reformer, being assisted by the brothers Olaus and Laurentius Petri, who in the year 1519 returned to Sweden, after having finished their studies at Wittenberg. Principles were at first not fixed, but reform was advanced with much tact and moderation. The king seems, just after the liberation of his fatherland from the dominion of the union-kings, which had degenerated into Danish oppression, to have been desirous of bringing the Church within such limits as not to stand in the way of the development of his state-policy. Consequently the political power and authority of the bishops was broken; part of the Church property was from necessity applied to paying off the national debt. The king took upon himself to regulate the salaries within the Church, leaving the clergy in possession of their third part of the tithes, and disposing himself of the rest, of which, however, a considerable share was allowed to the bishops, who declared themselves satisfied ‘ to be as rich or as poor as his Grace desired to have them.’ The cathedrals, canons, and monasteries were ordered to render an account of their revenues to the king, who provided for their wants what was necessary, and appropriated to the crown so much of the remainder as was not reclaimed by private donors or heirs. The power of public opinion, not less than occasional strong measures of government, put an end to monasteries, not so much by means of public decisions, as by a silent understanding that they could not be allowed to exist under the new state of things.

“ At the Diet of Westeras, 1527, these decisions were made. It was declared ‘ that the bishops and the dignitaries of the Church had been too powerful.’ The clergy should, in secular matters, answer before a secular tribunal. All fines for the violation of the Sabbath, &c., should be paid to the king and not to the bishop, ‘ because it was hard for the people to be under the sway of two masters.’ It was publicly declared that there was no intention to determine ‘ that no bishops should exist;’ on the contrary, ‘ it was indeed desirable that they should exist, but not be too powerful, so that the king or the empire might be in any danger from them.’

“ On the same occasion it was resolved that ‘ the pure word of God should be preached over all the kingdom.’ But a decisive declaration of a change, a precise enunciation of the doctrine, did not take place till the year 1593, when a general synod was held at Upsala, in consequence of the attempted papistical retrograde movement by King John III., at which synod the unaltered Augsburg Confession, and the three Symbols, were adopted as the Confession of the Swedish Protestant Church. It has remained so ever since, and the clergy are besides by their official oath, since the time of the Syncretistical con-

troversies, bound to observe the other symbolical books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

"The Swedish Church having, in the year 1593, thus expressly approved the Augsburg Confession, and the same religion, not less than the political circumstances, having more and more strengthened the connexion between Sweden and Germany, the state of the Church remained unaltered, except that the bishoprics were divided, and superintendents without episcopal name and consecration, were appointed to the separate districts. The superintendents were at first either dependent or subordinates of the bishop, to whose diocese their districts previously belonged. However, in the course of time they became by degree independent, and had even the right to ordain priests.

"King Gustavus I. already began to look upon the bishops with suspicious eyes, and seems, after the German Church had abolished them, to have been inclined to follow the example. However, in the view those men did not coincide, who particularly had assisted him in carrying out the reformation, so far as it concerned the abolition of the abuses within the Church. It is probable that this dissension prevented him from adopting any measures to dissolve the old constitution of the Church. But he frequently impressed upon the bishops to bear in mind, that they were merely inspectors over the clergy. Besides this he appointed a German, who was sent for as tutor for his eldest son, to be his own superintendent in the year 1539, investing him with such a power, as to encroach upon that of the bishops. He also made the commencement of dividing the old bishoprics into superintendencies: the Archbishopric of Upsala was thus divided by him.

"Although the Swedish Church has preserved, and in later times also confirmed the episcopal order, yet she has not maintained the principle that episcopacy is indispensable for the existence of the Church and efficiency of the sacraments. She acknowledges the order merely as a disciplinary arrangement, brought into existence by Divine Providence. The Church law of 1571, sanctioned by the Synod of Upsala, 1593, declares that, 'inasmuch as this order was very useful, and no doubt sprung from God the Holy Ghost (who gives all good gifts), it was also generally approved and received over all Christendom, and has thus ever since remained, and must still further remain, as long as the world exists.' The still valid Church law of 1686 acknowledges, 'as a great blessing of God the Holy Ghost that he sends faithful ministers to his congregation, who not only all of them have to preach the word of God, but of whom there also should be some, who, having received greater gifts, are besides to be inspectors over others, and to take care that those who are under their inspection and authority, faithfully and diligently, in doctrine and conduct of life, fulfil their official duties.' The solemn Church prayer, the Litany, contains also an express prayer for the bishops.

"The appointment of a bishop is at the present time proceeded with in the following manner:—When a vacancy occurs, the clergy and the ordinary of the diocese meet together, each district by itself, and the

chapter at their official place, all on a certain day previously fixed by the king. After having taken an oath to choose according to the best of their conscience, they proceed to vote for three persons. The votes being cast up, those three who have obtained the majority are put in nomination before His Majesty, who appoints one of them whom he thinks most fit for the office, he having no right to go beyond those three in nomination. With respect to the appointment of an archbishop, the chapter of the diocese of Upsala and its clergy in ordinary, the chapters of the other eleven dioceses, the chapter of the city of Stockholm (consisting of all the rectors in the city and the suburbs), and the *Senatus Academicus* of Upsala (i. e. all the professors in ordinary of the University)—making in all fifteen bodies—give their votes in a similar way for three persons, each of these bodies having one vote. Those three persons who have the majority of votes are put in nomination before the king, who also in this appointment is restricted to those in nomination. The selection of these electing bodies originated in the threefold function of the Archbishop, viz., as Bishop of his diocese, as the head of the Swedish Church, and *ex-officio* Speaker of the Chamber of the Clergy at the Diets, and as Pro-Chancellor of the University of Upsala.

“The bishops are consecrated, with prayer and imposition of hands, to their respective offices; but from the old custom and precept, that a bishop should be consecrated by two or three other bishops, the Swedish Church has deviated so far, as not to require more than one ordinator, who might be assisted by presbyters. The apostolical succession is kept up, without being considered as absolutely necessary. It has been kept up in this way, that the first bishops, who were appointed after the reformation, and also the first archbishop, were consecrated by Petrus Magni, who in the year 1523 was elected to the see of Westeras, being at that time residing at Rome, in the capacity of procurator in the house of Sancta Brigita, and also as a functionary in the chancery of the Pope. His election having been confirmed by the Pope, he was consecrated at Rome before his return to Sweden. There is no reason to suspect that the succession since that time has been broken, provided the question is limited to that point, that a bishop has not been consecrated by any one but a bishop. Although it is not always expressly recorded, when and by whom the bishops have been consecrated, still the practice which from the outset up to the present time has ever prevailed, namely, that the bishops have been consecrated, and by bishops too, must with sufficient security put the question at rest. All the Church laws enjoin, other public acts approve, historical records mention, when an opportunity occurs, the consecration of bishops. It has been remarked that, at the consecration of the second Protestant Archbishop of Sweden, in the year 1575, a bishop officiated, who was consecrated by one Bothvidus Sunonis of Strengnäs, of whom there is not sufficient evidence to show, where and by whom he was consecrated. That this Bothvidus, who was appointed bishop already in the year 1535, should then through some unaccountable circumstance have been not consecrated, or consecrated differently from the other bishops

elected during the reign of Gustavus I. is not to be credited ; and it is quite certain, that should there have been any ground for remark in this case, it would not have been overlooked at the consecration of Laurentius Petri, jun., in the year 1575, when King John already felt inclined to bring the Church back to a closer connexion with Rome when he was surrounded by persons friendly to popery ; when before the consecration ordered the archbishop elect to subscribe certain articles, amongst which was one 'De ritu et ordinatione episcoporum more antiquorum observanda ;' and when he obtained to have the consecration performed with unction and other ceremonies, which after the Reformation had been abolished.

"The functions, which exclusively devolve on the bishops, are to ordain priests, to hold visitations in the parishes of their dioceses (here a distinction must be made between the visitations of bishops, and those which are to be held by the archdeacons), consecration of new churches, the general inspection over the Church and the schools. Visitations and consecration of new churches might be performed by some one whom the bishop may appoint for that particular purpose. The bishops are ex-officio members of the chamber of the clergy at the diets. The bishop shares with the chapter the general administration of the diocese."

ASIA.

It is stated that M. Bonnard, missionary of the congregation of foreign missions, suffered martyrdom, by being beheaded, on the 1st of May last.

Great excitement has been caused among the Hindoos at Delhi by the conversion and public baptism of two natives, Sub-assistant-surgeon Chumunlal and Ram Chandra, teacher of science at Delhi College. The ceremony was performed with much solemnity, the catechumens answering the questions in a firm and audible voice. On their return home they were followed by a large mob, but the converts took refuge in the government dispensary, where Chumunlal resides. This being the first case of conversion in Delhi, it is expected to have a great effect in shaking the people in their adherence to Hindooism.

The vicar apostolic of Siam presented to the Pope on the 10th ult. two Siamese youths, bearers of a letter from the King of Siam, in which he says :—"I am not a follower of Christ ; I am a pious Buddhist, but I only cling to the philosophy of that religion which has been disguised by such absurd fables that it appears to me likely in the end to disappear altogether. Your Holiness may be certain that during my reign there shall not be any persecution of the Christians." The Pope received them graciously, and gave them his slipper and the fisherman's ring to kiss.

Bishop Olliffe, the popish vicar-apostolic of Eastern Bengal, has engaged a staff consisting of five ecclesiastic, five nuns, and five lay brothers (tradesmen of various sorts), members of the congregation of Sainte Croix, at Le Maus, in France, four Loretto nuns from Bavaria, and one priest from Dublin, to assist him in his "diocese," to which he is about to return.

A letter from St. Petersburg states that in the province of Jakoutsky (Siberia), the Greco-Russian missionaries are travelling about with a portable church, and have, in the space of eight months, gone over the greater part of the province. About fifteen hundred idolaters have during that period received baptism.

In an address delivered by Dr. Gobat at the Malta Protestant college, on the 5th inst., the bishop stated that the terms on which the Anglican bishopric at Jerusalem was founded, having been submitted to diplomatic consideration between the courts of England and Prussia, with the full concurrence of the highest ecclesiastical authorities in England, any seceders from the communion of the Christians of the East, comprised in the bishop's diocese, may now be received into communion with the Church of England in Jerusalem, provided they make a declaration before the competent Turkish authority, of their wish to be placed under the bishop's jurisdiction, which secures for the proselyte the protection of England, Prussia, and the Sublime Porte.

The French journal "*L'Ami de la Religion*" lately made the following report concerning the holy sepulchres :—

"We shall soon know whether the intervention of France has triumphed over the obstacles raised by rival passions to the recognition of our rights in the affair of the holy places. Afif Bey, the commissioner of the Porte, has arrived at Jerusalem. The Greek schismatic patriarch has also arrived there from Constantinople, and it is said that he is disposed to spread money in all directions, and the consul-general of Russia at Beyrout has received orders from his government to leave immediately for the Holy City. Our adversaries are therefore prepared to support their usurping pretensions. They will not, however, find the field open to them. M. Botta embarked at Beyrout on the 19th, in company with the Abbé Dequevauvillier, chancellor of the patriarch of Jerusalem. He is the bearer of instructions from the French ambassador, and is, it is said, charged to act as the honour and interest of the Latins may require. We have no doubt that his presence and his firm language will suffice to defeat all intrigues."

It appears, however, that the Sultan had resolved to repair the defects in the cupola of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at his own expense, to appease the disputes to which the state of the building had given rise among the Greek and Latin Christians :—

"A Turkish engineer had arrived, with orders to survey the edifice, and make the necessary measurements and estimates for the repairs ; on the day after the arrival of the engineer, Affif Effendi, a conference was held in the body of the church, at which he met the Greek and Armenian patriarchs, the catholic bishop, and the French consul, M. Botte. Affif Effendi opened the sitting by stating it to be the declared will of the sultan that the dispute about rebuilding the cupola should be settled ; he had therefore resolved, without prejudice to the rights of the powers interested in it, to undertake the restoration at his own cost ; the Effendi notified, accordingly, that he should commence the survey on the following morning. This communication gave rise to an

angry discussion between the heads of the three Christian Churches during which the Turks present quietly smoked their chibouques. A few days afterwards another meeting was held in the Church of the Grave of the Virgin to hear the firman read, by which some of the causes of the continual conflicts between the Greeks and Latins would, it had been hoped, be settled. The firman gives the Latin or Catholic priests the right to perform divine service in the Church of the Sepulchre on condition that they shall not make the smallest alteration in the building itself. But, as the Latin priests will refuse to perform mass before 'schismatic' altars, it is believed the firman will be useless. The Latins are also secured in the right of opening the great door of the Church at Bethlehem four times during the year, and to enter in procession. This right is likely to produce collisions, in which, before, the Turkish soldiers will have to separate the combatants by force, to the scandal of the Christians of all sects."

The Roman Catholics are extremely enraged at the failure of all the attempts to dispossess the Greeks of the Holy Sepulchre. It appears that the Emperor of Russia is just as determined to maintain the latter in possession, as the Romanists are to eject them.

AMERICA.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.—The "Canadian Churchman" gives the following as the religious census of Upper Canada, taken under the authority of law, in the years 1842, 1848, and 1852:—

	1842.	1848.	1852.
Church of England . . .	128,897	166,340	223,928
Methodists (all) . . .	99,343	137,752	208,611
Presbyterians (all) . . .	115,120	148,182	204,622
Church of Rome . . .	78,119	119,810	167,930
Baptists	19,622	28,053	45,457
Lutherans		7,186	12,085
Congregationalists . . .	5,095	5,993	7,931
Quakers	6,230	5,951	7,497
Universalists		2,196	2,688
Unitarians		678	833
Not classed	23,582	78,461	70,471
Totals	486,055	723,332	952,005

The Bishop of Toronto is engaged in a Confirmation tour through his diocese. At Perth, he preached and confirmed 126 persons; and at Smith's Falls, he confirmed ninety-one. A colonial paper says, notwithstanding his advanced age, and the very great amount of labour and fatigue which he has to undergo in his Confirmation tour; his lordship appeared in good health, and as active as ever.

An Act of the Provincial Legislature of Canada has recently received Her Majesty's assent, by which the patronage of the rectories endowments out of the clergy reserves, instead of being vested in the Government

the province, is henceforth vested in, and is to be exercised by, the Church Society of the diocese.

On Wednesday, November 10, a special general meeting of the Church Society of the Diocese of Toronto was held under the presidency of the bishop, to consider what steps should be adopted for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the statute 14 and 15 Vic., clxxv. The bishop explained to the meeting the position of the forty-four rectories effected by the act, only one or two of which are enabled to support the incumbents in common decency and comfort, the rest being dependent on the aid afforded by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which is dispensed through the bishop of the diocese.

"The Act," said his lordship, "surrenders the power of nominating to the rectories, which was theoretically in the Crown, to a large public body, which, from its numbers, can have little or no feeling of individual responsibility; but, as the Crown could not surrender more than it possessed, and never did or could act except through the bishop, so must it be with the Society; for it can no more dispense with the concurrence of the bishop than the Crown could do."

The following resolutions were carried by the meeting unanimously:—

"That from the respect and affection which this Church Society entertains for our venerable diocesan, and the debt of gratitude which we owe to his lordship for his untiring exertions and indefatigable zeal in promoting the best interests of the Church during the long period of fifty years, to which, under Divine Providence, is mainly owing the prosperous condition of the Canadian branch of the Catholic Church, it would be felt by the Society to be injurious to the Church to vest the presentation to rectories in any other hands than those of the diocesan—resolved, therefore, that the patronage be vested in the diocesan.

"That a committee be appointed, consisting of the Chief Justice, the Hon. Mr. De Blaquiére, the Hon. J. H. Cameron, the Rev. H. J. Grasett, the Rev. F. L. Osler, and the Rev. D. E. Blake, to prepare a by-law to be submitted to the next monthly meeting, declaring in whom the right of presentation to the rectories in this diocese shall be hereafter vested."

The foundation-stone of a new church has been laid at Waterford, diocese of Toronto.

The corner-stone of a new church has been laid for the Mohawk Mission at the Bay of Quinte, in the archdeaconry of Kingston. A correspondent of the "*Canadian Churchman*" mentions, that, "after the stone was adjusted, the 100th Psalm was sung by the Indians in their native tongue. The effect produced by this simple act of praise was most pleasing, and richly suggestive of holy and grateful reflections."

The "*Canadian Churchman*" contains the charter constituting Trinity College, Toronto, a University, bearing date of the 16th of July last.

The "*Canadian Churchman*" contains an address from the Bishop of Toronto to the Legislative Assembly of Canada, remonstrating against

the injustice of the secular school system, to the support of which the members of the United Church of England and Ireland in Toronto being upwards of eleven thousand out of thirty thousand, the whole population of the city, are made to contribute, by paying more than one-third of the educational rates, amounting to some thousand pounds annually, while they have not the power of establishing, out of all the money they pay, one single school, but are compelled to establish parochial schools for their several congregations by private contributions, in order to protect their children from "the growing evils of the present irreligious plan of education, in which nothing is attempted to be taught but worldly knowledge; while that knowledge to which all others should be subservient is entirely neglected."

The Bishop of Quebec, during his late tour, visited the Mission at Bourg-Louis, where he held a Confirmation, and consecrated the church and burying-ground; also the chapel at St. Catharine's, in Fossambault, where a Confirmation was likewise held. His lordship then proceeded to Bishop's College, at Lennoxville, being accompanied from Richmond by the Bishop of Montreal, the two prelates having met for a special meeting of the college corporation. After three days spent at the college, their lordships proceeded to the outlet of Lake Memphramagog, where the two dioceses meet, and where it is their hope to establish a joint mission of an itinerant character. The Bishop of Quebec, on his downward route, consecrated the little church at the *Rivière du Loup en haut*, where the Confirmation of a few persons was also held.

The Bishop of Montreal has been visiting the Bishop of Toronto and assisted at the services at the Church of the Holy Trinity, Toronto, on the Sunday after his arrival, preaching an able discourse on the occasion.

The "Church Times," Halifax, 11th Sept. 1852, publishes the following account of the Bishop of Nova Scotia's visitation of the eastern shores of Nova Scotia:—

"On Wednesday, the 4th of August, after various delays and disappointments, arising from the state of the weather, the bishop finally left Halifax in a carriage, accompanied by the Hon. M. B. Almon and Mrs. Almon, and the Rev. Edmund Maturin, Curate of St. Paul's, who acted as chaplain to his lordship. On the following day, they proceeded to sea, but had scarcely left the harbour, when they were becalmed, and obliged to return for the night. On Friday the weather was still more unfavourable, accompanied with easterly winds, and dense fog, which rendered it impossible to leave the harbour. Although the rain fell heavily during the night, the next day was equally unpropitious; and, finding it impracticable to reach Beaver Harbour in time for the following Sunday, according to his lordship's intention, the bishop resolved to take advantage of the delay for the purpose of visiting the neighbouring missionary stations along the shore; and accordingly, on Saturday morning, his lordship landed in a fisherman's boat, and walked over a rough road through the woods, amidst constant

rain, over an extent of eight miles, and arrived in the evening at the residence of the Rev. Robert Jameson, at Ship Harbour. The clergy also followed his lordship's example, and landed on the shores of the harbour with the view of dividing their labours on the following day between the adjacent churches. In accordance with this arrangement, the bishop preached twice on Sunday in the church at Ship Harbour, while the Rev. T. Dunn performed two services in Jedore church, and the Rev. E. Maturin held an evening service at Musquodoboit Harbour. On the next day, the Rev. Messrs. Maturin and Dunn left Jedore Harbour in the schooner, and joined the bishop at Ship Harbour. His lordship had been anxiously waiting for their arrival, and had gone out to meet them in an open boat, rowed by himself and Mr. Jamieson, for a distance of several leagues; having thus exhibited his proficiency in the use of the oar, which is so important an accomplishment along these shores. It will be observed, that there was no Confirmation held in Mr. Jamieson's mission on this occasion, as it is the bishop's intention to perform this service in that station after his return to Halifax.

"At an early hour on Tuesday morning, the 10th of August, the schooner got under weigh, and proceeded to Beaver Harbour, the missionary station of the Rev. James Breeding. Notice was immediately given for the celebration of divine service on the following day; and accordingly, on Wednesday afternoon, at the hour of two o'clock, P.M., the service commenced by the solemn consecration of the church and burial-ground to the public worship of Almighty God, the former being dedicated by the name of the Church of St. James the Apostle. The church is a neat little building, decently furnished and provided with open seats of uniform arrangement, and capable of accommodating nearly 200 persons. It has received some valuable assistance from several friends of the incumbent in the Isle of Jersey, who have presented, among other things, a decent set of vessels for the administration of the Holy Communion. It is satisfactory to find that the church has been completed free from all incumbrance whatever. The Rev. T. Dunn acted as commissary at the consecration, after which the service of the Church was read by the Rev. E. Maturin, during which, after the second lesson, the interesting service of adult baptism was witnessed by the congregation, the candidate being a respectable young woman, who was baptized by the bishop, and confirmed with the other candidates."

UNITED STATES.—The "New York Churchman" gives a detailed report of the proceedings of the Diocesan Convention at which Dr. Wainwright was elected Provisional Bishop. The Convention sat three days, and it was not till the ninth ballot that a sufficient majority was arrived at to constitute a canonical election.

The election was followed by a public service of thanksgiving for the happy termination of the election at which the church was crowded.

At a subsequent sitting, the bishop elect, after a feeling address to the Convention, invited them to join with him in the following prayer at the institution of a minister, which he appropriated to himself, proceeding to the chancel, and kneeling at the altar :—" O Lord my God ! I am not worthy that Thou shouldst come under my roof, yet Thou hast honoured Thy servant with appointing him to stand in Thy house, and to serve at Thy holy altar. To Thee and to Thy service I devote myself, soul, body, and spirit—with all their powers and faculties. Fill my memory with the words of Thy law ; enlighten my understanding with the illumination of the Holy Ghost ; and may all the wishes and desires of my will centre in what Thou hast commanded. And to make me instrumental in promoting the salvation of the people now to be committed to my charge, grant that I may faithfully administer Thy Holy Sacraments, and by my life and doctrine set forth Thy true and lively word.

" Be ever with me in the performance of all the duties of my ministry ; in prayer, to quicken my devotion ; in praises to heighten my love and gratitude ; and in preaching to give a readiness of thought and expression suitable to the clearness and excellency of Thy Holy Word. Grant this for the sake of Jesus Christ Thy Son our Saviour."

Considerable discussion arose as to the provision to be made for the provisional bishop, and it was finally ordered that the treasurer of the Convention be directed to pay to the provisional bishop of the diocese, until the next annual Convention, all the income of the disposable fund over and above 2500 dollars ; and the Standing Committee which had been appointed before on this subject was ordered to make a fresh report to the next Convention, and to devise means for making the salary for the present year not less than 4000 dollars.

It appears that Dr. Wainwright was born in England, as an American citizen, in 1791. He came to the United States as a child, and was educated at Cambridge, where he held a professorship. He was subsequently rector of a church in Hartford, Conn. In January, 1821, he came to New York, and was made assistant minister of Trinity Church, having charge of the Grace Church congregation. About 1834 he resigned, and took the rectorship of Trinity Church, Boston. Five or six years afterwards he returned to his former post of assistant-minister at Trinity Church, New York, taking charge of St. John's Chapel, where he has ever since remained. Dr. Wainwright has been prominent in the councils of the Church, and is now secretary of the House of Bishops. He has travelled through Europe, Egypt, and Palestine, and other countries. Seven or eight years ago he was engaged in a controversy with Dr. Potts, on the legality and propriety of the office of Bishop. It is hoped that the elevation of Dr. Wainwright to his new office will heal the divisions which have for a long time existed in the diocese of New York.

A motion was made for the division of the diocese of New York,

with the consent of the General Convention, the new diocese, north of the boundary lines of the counties of Columbia, Greene, and Delaware, to be called the "Diocese of Northern New York."

On Wednesday, the 10th ult., the Rev. J. M. Wainwright, D.D., was consecrated as Provisional Bishop of the Eastern Diocese of New York, in Trinity Church, with circumstances of a very gratifying character. A correspondent has sent us the "New York Enquirer," from which we abridge the following interesting particulars:—

"Every available portion of space was occupied with seats, and yet thousands were unable to procure tickets, and other thousands were turned away from the doors. At eleven o'clock, the south vestry-door was opened, and the procession entered, in reverse order. The students of the General Theological Seminary led the way, followed by the unofficiating clergy (nearly all in surplices) the seven officiating deacons and twelve officiating priests then entered, and, finally, the Provisional Bishop elect, supported by two priests, and followed by ten bishops, closed the immense array, which in all numbered over 200 clergy in surplices and robes,—a larger number, it is believed, than was ever before assembled on a similar occasion on this continent. All the clergy, on taking their places, remained standing until the bishops had entered, and all knelt in silent devotion at the same moment."

Morning prayer having been said by the Rev. Dr. Hawks, assisted by the Rev. Drs. Vinton, Kip, and Haight, and the Rev. Mr. Bedell. The ante-communion office was said by the Lord Bishop of Montreal, assisted in the epistle by the Bishop of Pennsylvania, and in the gospel by the Bishop of Maryland. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of New Hampshire; and, after an anthem—

The Provisional Bishop elect was presented to the right reverend the Bishop of Connecticut (the senior bishop in the Church, and presiding bishop on this occasion), by the Bishop of Indiana and the assistant Bishop of Connecticut.

We have to record the decease of another American Bishop, the Right Rev. Philander Chase, D.D., Bishop of Illinois. He expired at his residence at Jubilee on the 20th ult., from the results of a fall from a carriage, in which he has long been in the habit of taking daily exercise. He was in his seventy-eighth year; and four children survive him—the Rev. Dudley Chase, of Chicago; the Rev. Philander Chase; Mrs. Chamberlaine, the wife of the Rev. J. S. Chamberlaine, who has just gone to Minnesota territory, under the direction of Bishop Kemper; and Mr. Henry J. Chase, who has had the supervision for some years of the out-door business operations of the College establishment. Bishop Chase was consecrated to the episcopate (of Ohio) Feb. 11, 1819; and, as the senior in date of consecration, was, according to a rule of the House of Bishops, its presiding officer. He is succeeded in his diocese by the Right Rev. Dr. Whitehouse, the assistant bishop, consecrated Nov. 20, 1851; and, as the presiding Bishop, by the Right Rev. Thomas Church

Brownell, Bishop of Connecticut, who was consecrated to the see Oct. 27, 1819.

The "New York Churchman" states, that the Rev. Dr. Hawks has been elected Bishop of Rhode Island.

The Episcopal Convention of the diocese of New Jersey reassembled on Wednesday, the 14th of July, in Trinity Church, Newark, for the purpose of hearing the report of the committee of seven laymen appointed at the last session to investigate the charges against Bishop Doane, contained in the presentment. It occupied two hours and a half in reading, and comprises, besides the regular report, a large amount of documentary evidence, letters, inventories, schedules, &c., which will make, when published, a bulky pamphlet. The following resolutions were adopted by a vote of—clergy, 15 to 4; laity, 21 to 5:—

"1. Resolved—That the results of this investigation, and the evidence now laid before the Convention, renew and strengthen the confidence heretofore expressed in the integrity of the right reverend the bishop of the diocese; and in our opinion fully exculpate him from any charge of crime or immorality made against him.

"2. Resolved—That the Convention of New Jersey has now fulfilled the duty which previous conventions have felt and expressed their readiness to fulfil, of making a full, searching, and honest inquiry into any allegation against the bishop, when formally brought before it upon definite charges; and we appeal to the Church at large to ratify our declaration, that this duty has been faithfully, and in the fear of God, performed.

"3. Resolved—That a committee of four clergymen and three laymen be appointed, by ballot, to lay the report of the committee and the accompanying evidence before the court appointed for the trial of the bishop; that such committee present a written representation, on behalf of this convention, setting forth its legal and canonical position and rights; and earnestly and respectfully urging the right reverend the bishops to consider whether (apart from all abstract questions of power) it will be wise, or just, or for the peace of God's Church, to proceed further upon the charges laid before them.

"4. Resolved—That the report and the testimony be printed in the journal, and a copy of the same be transmitted to every bishop of the Church, and to the standing committees of such dioceses as are without bishops, or whose bishop is under disability."

The "New York Churchman" states that a new presentment has been served upon the Bishop of New Jersey, to be tried by a Court of Bishops at Camden, New Jersey, on the 7th of October. The presentment, though dated the 22nd of July, was not served on Bishop Doane till late at night on the 6th of September, just within the thirty days required before the meeting of the court. It is subsequent to the report of the committee to the late Special Convention of New Jersey.

In pursuance of a request addressed to him from his own diocese,

the Bishop of New Jersey called another Special Convention of his diocese to assemble at Newark on the 27th of October, "to decide upon and pursue such course in regard to the interests and just rights of the diocese, as the action of three bishops, in making what purports to be a new presentment of the bishop of this diocese, may in their judgment require."

The Bishops' Court for the trial of Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, upon the presentment made by the Bishops of Maine, Virginia, and Ohio, was formally opened at Camden on Tuesday, the 7th inst. The sitting of the court was not public, but the following facts have transpired:—The members present were Bishops Hopkins, Smith, Kemper, McCoskry, De Lancey, Whittingham, Johns, Eastburn, Chase, Lee, Potter, Upfold, Green, and Rutledge. The Bishop of Vermont was appointed President. An adjournment to Burlington, for the convenience of the witnesses, was warmly opposed, especially by the presenters, but carried by a large majority. A resolution proposed by Bishop Johns, that communications from third parties should not be received, intended to exclude the proceedings of the New Jersey Convention, was rejected by a decided majority. The last-named document was read, and produced a marked effect. Bishop McCoskry afterwards moved that no action be taken on the first presentment, in consequence of the action of the New Jersey Convention, and that all action should be postponed on the second until after the Special Convention of the Diocese should have met and acted on the subject.

A pamphlet has been issued by the clergy, setting forth the grievance of insufficient salaries. The average salary of the clergy is 450 dollars; in Maryland not over 400 dollars, while the Washington clergy petition for an increase of 20 per cent. on their salaries of 1000 or 1200 dollars a year, found to be insufficient for their support.

A meeting of "Spiritualists" has lately been held at Worcester, United States, at which various revelations said to have been received from spirits,—that is, according to their doctrine, spiritualized bodies,—were detailed, and marriage was denounced as the root of all sin, folly, and suffering, and the great obstacle to the regeneration of the world.

Mr. Mullen, a Roman Catholic priest, has published the following statistics in the "Tablet," showing the losses Popery has sustained in America:—

"The present population of the United States is about 25,000,000, and of these the Catholic Church claims only 1,980,000. From the year 1825 to 1844, 1,250,000 left Ireland, 1,000,000 of whom came to America; the proportion of Catholics among them may be very fairly estimated at 800,000. Since that period to the present, the numbers who emigrated here from Ireland, at the lowest calculation, were 1,500,000; and taking the Catholics as above, we will have, in nine years, 1,200,000. A large number (say half a million) came from Germany, some from Italy, France, Belgium, and other countries, during the last ten years, half of whom were Catholics, say 250,000.

Twelve years ago America had a Catholic population (according to Dr. England, Bishop of Charlestown) of 1,200,000. Calculating the increase of this number by births at the very small number of 500,000 and adding for converts in the larger cities and towns 20,000, we will have the following total:—

Catholic emigrants from the year 1825 to 1844	800,000
Catholic emigrants from 1844 to 1852	1,200,000
Catholic emigrants from other countries	250,000
American Catholic population twelve years ago	1,200,000
Increase by births since	500,000
Number of converts	20,000

Number who ought to be Catholics	3,970,000
Number who are Catholics	1,980,000

Number lost to the Catholic Church	1,990,000
--	-----------

Say, in round numbers, two millions!"

AUSTRALASIA.—On Aug. 16, the Lord Bishop of Sydney bade farewell to the clergy of Sydney, and the members of the Church, previous to his departure for England.

Divine Service was celebrated in the Cathedral at ten o'clock in the morning, at which a large number of persons were present, and partook of the Holy Communion at the hands of the bishop, assisted by the Venerable Archdeacon of Cumberland, the Rev. R. Allwood, and the Rev. George King.

After the service the congregation adjourned to St. Andrew's school-room, in the Cathedral Close, for the purpose of receiving the bishop's farewell address.

The Bishop of Melbourne has, in an appendix to his Charge, published a statement of the qualifications in respect to knowledge which he will require of all candidates for ordination. They are:—

1. An accurate knowledge of the English Bible. 2. Ability to state and to prove the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel. 3. A competent knowledge of the evidences of Christianity. 4. A familiar acquaintance with the Book of Common Prayer and the other formularies of our Church. 5. A knowledge of ecclesiastical history.

With regard to the Fathers, and the Latin and Greek languages, the bishop states his reasons for not requiring a knowledge of them, the former, because a superficial acquaintance with them is likely to be prejudicial rather than beneficial; the latter because Latin is no longer essential for holy orders, and because Greek, although valuable for reading the New Testament in the original, is not indispensable.

The following address from Bishop Short was read to the various congregations of the Church in Adelaide, and in other parts of the province, at Easter last.

"Dear Brethren.—The Apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians Church, says, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,

the Father of mercies and God of all comfort, who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort others with the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God.' The like reason have we so to bless God, even as the Apostle : for if our trials have abounded, so also have we been comforted of God under them, by several circumstances of encouragement, as well as by experience of the faith in his promises and providence, which faileth not. When, for example, it seemed good to the 'powers that be,' that all assistance from the State to the preaching of the gospel should cease ; and we were exhorted to trust in the divine institution of the Church for the maintenance of its own ministry, the ready zeal with which you responded to the call inspired a confident hope that in nothing we should come behind those who, for conscience sake, had trusted for their support to the liberality of their followers. We were further comforted by the assembling of the Church, for taking counsel together, after the primitive example. You conferred with your bishop and clergy upon the measures best calculated to promote fellowship among its numerous but dispersed members ; and gathering means for the extension and support of its ministry. Looking back upon those meetings, I cannot but take comfort in the wise, sober, and godly feeling which appeared to prevail in them, as well as in the earnest desire to work effectually for the maintenance of divine worship, in all such places as the services of our Church might be required.

"In the midst, however, of our consultations, it pleased God to try our faith and patience very severely, by the sudden removal of a large portion of our population. If we had trusted in the arm of flesh, we should have been not only cast down, but in despair. Our God, however, is still a God of comfort in all our tribulation. He has bidden us cast all our care upon Him, for He hath said, 'I will never leave thee nor forsake thee.' We trust, therefore, in the living God. Already the cloud which hung over our temporal prospects has begun to break. Numerous are the instances in which they whom God has prospered in digging gold out of the dust of the earth have been forward to obey the apostle's precept, 'owe no man any thing,' and 'render unto all their dues.' And this assures us that if we faithfully sow unto God's people spiritual things, we shall in due time reap of their carnal things. The ordinance of the Lord cannot fail. 'They who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel.' But trust in God's providence must not supersede our use of means. It depends, therefore, upon you, brethren, to confirm this our assured reliance upon the word and will of God.

"After due and solemn consideration, your representatives, in conference assembled, have proposed the establishment of a General Pastoral Aid Fund, by the payment of one shilling each calendar month by all the members of our Church. From this general fund the thinly peopled and poorer districts are to receive aid in their endeavour to support their own clergyman, instead of each congregation limiting its sympathies and affections to itself, who should then feel (as is our bounden duty) members one of another in the body of Christ. The

strong and wealthy would bear the infirmities of the weak and need Christian charity, 'the very bond of peace and all virtues,' would flow amongst us; and the Churches, being at peace within themselves with each other, and walking in the fear of the Lord, would be multiplied. Shall these hopes, beloved brethren, be disappointed? Shall our love grow cold because many have departed for a season from amongst us? Shall the fruit of all our anxious deliberations and our prayers be frustrated, and, after we have willed, when the time does have arrived shall be weighed in the balances and found wanting? Better would it have been for us never to have devised liberal than never to have purposed 'to honour God with the first fruits of increase,' than, after having been thus minded, to use lightness. Be far not to vow, than 'having vowed, not to pay.' If there be in you then, as I believe there is, 'any comfort of love, any bowels of mercies,' fulfil, I beseech you, that which your representatives have proposed; and set on foot a collection for 'the elders and deacons' who are among you.' Let 'them that serve well and labour in the word and ministry, be counted worthy of double honour.' What man is there among you in this favoured land that cannot contribute a shilling each month to the general support of the ministers of religion? It is not the tenth, but scarcely an eightieth part of a labouring man's ordinary earnings. Let that collection be begun zealously 'as unto God, and not unto man.' Let not covetousness prove the curse of the Church, nor our riches be cankered by the idolatry of wealth! Be ye partakers with other men's sins. As in the Church of Corinth, 'let not lay up in store for charitable uses on the first day of the week, 'the Lord's Day,' according 'as God has prospered every man.' This is the primitive 'Christian way.' It would be an offering to God, not gathered by man; and thus every man who loved the Lord would be diligent gladly to give of the little which he possessed. No man in a congregation of men, can really be Christ's in whom the love of God is not shed abroad in the heart; and he who loves Him that begets love also them that are begotten of Him.

"Brethren, let me have this comfort of you; that as to will be present with you, so now to do may, through God's grace, be present also. I beseech you to know them that are over you in the Lord, admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake. Let your care of them flourish again, and while ye watch for your souls as they that must give account, and give themselves wholly to these things, do you provide for their temporal wants that they may labour much in the Lord, and not be drawn aside from cares or anxieties to worldly business. 'Who feedeth the flock eateth not of the milk of the flock:' even so the Christian Pastor is to be sustained by the free offering of the Lord's people, even as Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and His Apostles, were ministered unto by the substance of them who believed on Him unto eternal life. That thus honour God, He will honour, and look whatsoever they do shall prosper.

"Brethren, if ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them ; for godliness hath the promise of the life that now is, as well as of that which is to come. Fare ye well in the Lord.

"From your faithful friend and Chief Pastor,

"AUGUSTUS ADELAIDE."

The "Tasmanian Chronicle" publishes some documents in connexion with the Colonial Church movement in that diocese. The bishop issued a circular letter "inviting" the election of lay-delegates on the 16th of June, to meet on the 23rd of the same month, in accordance with the following report of a committee, consisting of the Archdeacon of Hobart Town and the clergy of the district of Hobart, appointed at a general meeting of the clergy of the diocese, on the 28th of January, 1852 :—

"For the purpose of considering by what plan the opinions of the lay-communicants of the Church might be best obtained upon the matters then brought before the clergy by the following words of a circular from the bishop :—

" 'I feel myself justified in requesting you to meet me, first, to consider how far you are prepared to adopt the general principle set forth in minute 3, of the conference at Sydney, that future synods and conventions, duly constituted, may be the means of settling many questions of great importance to the well-being of the Church ; and, secondly, to adopt measures for obtaining, by representation, the opinions of the laity upon the same point.'

This committee considers :—

"1. That the opinions of the laity of the Church may be best obtained by a general meeting of lay-delegates, to be held in Hobart Town on a day to be named by the bishop.

"2. That such lay-delegates be communicants of the Church ; one to be elected from every parish or district being under the licensed charge of any one clergyman ; such delegate being resident within the said parish or district.

"3. That the electors be male adults, resident within the parish or district which is to return the delegate, and declaring themselves to be members of the Church of England.

"4. That such lay-delegates be chosen at a meeting of electors, held on a day to be fixed by the bishop, at some central place within the parish or district, the said meeting having been convened by the clergyman by notice to his congregation or congregations during divine service on two several Sundays before the day of election.

"5. That electors shall only be allowed to vote personally.

(Signed) "FITZHERBERT A. MARRIOTT, Chairman."

The Bishop of Tasmania having refused to receive or countersign testimonials as to soundness of doctrine from clergymen who had signed the "solemn Declaration of Ministers," containing among others a denial of "the authority of any Church or minister to prescribe to any individual in matters of religion, *in opposition to their own judgment ;*" and having, likewise, refused admission to holy orders to candidates

denying the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, certain clergymen laymen of the diocese formed a Tasmania branch of the London testant Defence Association, and appointed a deputation, to wait the bishop, and demand of him to withdraw the condemnation of ce clergymen involved in the repudiation of their testimonials, to re his resolution to refuse holy orders to persons not holding the doc of baptismal regeneration, and, moreover, to prohibit the use of Wordsworth's "Theophilus Anglicanus" at the college. The bi declined to accede to these demands, in a lengthened reply, whic proposes to publish, and in the mean time he has published a l briefly summing up the reasons of his refusal.

The resolutions passed at the meeting of the Church Educ Society (see "Guardian," Sept. 1) have led to a further step o part of Bishop Selwyn towards obtaining a constitution for the Ch in the colony of New Zealand. His lordship has issued the follo pastoral letter:—

"St. John's College, April 19, 185

"My dear friends and brethren,—The reports which I have recd from England, Sydney, Adelaide, Melbourne, and Tasmania, have vinced me that the time has come when it is my duty to press upon the necessity of applying to the heads of the State and of the Chur England for authority to frame, under their sanction, such a for constitution for our branch of the English Church, as may defin privileges and duties of all the members, whether clerical or lay, secure to them a due participation in the management of its affairs.

"The necessity of this measure arises mainly from two causes:—

"First, that the Church in this colony is not established by l and, consequently, that a large portion of the ecclesiastical la England is inapplicable to us.

"Secondly, that the Church in this colony is dependent mainly i the voluntary contributions of its members.

"It would be impossible, within any reasonable compass, to i out the necessary differences of system, resulting from these ca which must exist between our colonial branch and the mother Ch as it is in England, established by law, and supported by perma endowments.

"We can scarcely expect that such a revision of the ecclesias law as would meet our wants will be undertaken in England; bec the Convocation of the clergy is no longer allowed to meet for delib tion, and the British Parliament is no longer composed only of mem of the Church. Our own colonial legislature, for the same rea cannot be considered competent to enact laws for the government of Church.

"It follows, therefore, that we must either be content to hav laws to guide us, or that we must apply for the usual power grante all incorporated bodies—to frame by-laws for ourselves in all i matters as relate to our own peculiar position; reserving to Majesty and to the heads of the Church in England such rights

powers as may be necessary to maintain the Queen's supremacy, and the unity and integrity of our Church. I therefore submit to you the following statement of a few fundamental principles which, with your approbation, might be made the basis of an application for a charter of incorporation to be granted to our branch of the English Church. It would be reserved for the Convention itself to decide upon all the minor details of our Church constitution, so far as we may be left free to legislate for ourselves.

"Commending you to the guidance of Him who is able to give you a right judgment in all things, I remain, your affectionate friend and pastor,

"G. A. NEW ZEALAND."

"General Principles proposed as the Basis of a Constitution of the Church in New Zealand."

"1. That the bishops, clergy, and laity shall be three distinct orders, the consent of all of which shall be necessary to all acts binding upon the Church at large.

"2. Subject to the foregoing principle, that each order be at liberty to conduct its deliberations separately, or to unite with the others, at its own discretion.

"3. That provisionally, till a definition of Church membership shall have been agreed upon by a General Convention, every person shall be deemed a member of the Church of England who shall make a written declaration to that effect to the clergyman of his parish or district.

"4. That every adult Church member who shall have been duly registered be entitled to vote at the election of lay representatives to the first General Convention.

"5. That it shall rest with the General Convention to decide how and by whom all patronage shall be exercised, and in what manner all persons holding Church offices shall be removable from the same; and also to fix the amount of all salaries, fees, and other allowances.

"6. That it is necessary that the Church body, constituted as above, should be legally incorporated; and that all sites of churches, burial-grounds, schools, and lands for endowment of the Church, &c., should be vested in the general incorporation.

"7. That in order to maintain the Queen's supremacy, and union with the mother Church, a draft of the constitution proposed for the Church in New Zealand be submitted to Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, through the Metropolitan Bishop of Sydney; with a petition that Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to direct the necessary steps to be taken, whether by Act of Parliament or by royal charter, to secure to our branch of the English Church the liberty, within certain limits, of framing laws for its own government.

"8. That neither the doctrines nor the ritual of the Church of England, nor the authorized version of the Bible, shall in any way be subject to the decision of the General Convention.

"9. That the Bishop of New Zealand be requested to embody the

above resolutions in the form of a petition, and to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying into effect the wishes of the memorialists.

The Rev. G. H. Nobbs, chaplain of Pitcairn's Island, has been admitted to priest's orders, by the Lord Bishop of London, in the parish church of Fulham. The Rev. R. G. Baker, vicar, took part in the solemn and interesting service. The Rev. T. B. Murray, M.A., presented the rev. candidate to the bishop. The vessels for the Holy Communion, which were used for the first time, immediately after ordination, were placed by Mr. Baker in Mr. Nobbs's hands, for the church in Pitcairn's Island.

"The eventful history of the 'Bounty,' which led to the occupation of Pitcairn's Island by part of the mutineers, with some men and women of Tahiti, in 1789, is well known. After a few years spent in violence and unbridled licence, the Tahitian men, and seven of the nine mutineers, including Fletcher Christian, the leader of the mutiny, came to an untimely end; one of the remaining two died of consumption; and within ten years of their landing, John Adams remained the sole survivor of the men who had taken possession of the island. This remarkable man became impressed with the solemn responsibility of his position, when he found himself surrounded with a number of young persons, all children of the mutineers, between the ages of three and fifteen, ignorant of God, and likely, under the influence of the Tahitian mothers, to become idolaters. About the same time he thought him of the Bible, which had been much used by Christian and also by Young in his last illness. On finding this, as well as a Prayer Book, which had also been saved from the 'Bounty,' he set himself to read their contents, which at first he was scarcely able to do from his imperfect scholarship. Still he persevered, so that he was shortly able to instruct the young people to read; and he became so impressed and imbued with the Gospel lessons of salvation, that he undertook the regular religious instruction of the inhabitants. From this time peace and contentment pervaded this small Christian community. Early in 1829 John Adams died, at the age of sixty-five years.

"Five months before his death, a young man, moved with a desire to assist him in his work, arrived in the island, and being kindly received by the inhabitants, was, immediately on the death of Adams, appointed to the office of schoolmaster and pastor. In these capacities, as well as that of their medical adviser, Mr. Nobbs has almost uninterruptedly continued ever since among them. During that period, namely, between twenty-four and twenty-five years, several ships have visited the island; and the accounts brought back by the visitors of the singular innocence and simplicity of manners that prevail among the inhabitants, have from time to time excited great interest in the public mind."

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, NOTICES, AND INTELLIGENCE.

Africa, Mr. W. D. Cooley on, 340; strange misconceptions about it, 341; journey of two Pombeiros to the Zambeze, 342; their route, 343; the River Lulúa the origin of the Congo, 344; the Muropúe, or Sovereign of the Alúa, 345; Quigila, district of salt and copper mine, 346; Dr. Lucerda's journey, 347, 348; his death, 349; the Cazembe, 350; the snow mountain Killima Njáro, 351; the Lake Ngami, 352; the principal information collected in Mr. Cooley's book, 353.

Badger, Rev. G. P., his work on the Nestorians, 251.

Bunsen, *The Chevalier*, his opinions, 239; he proves the so-called "Philosophumena of Origen" to be by Hippolytus, 240; its bearing on the authenticity of the Gospel of St. John, 241; the history of the Roman Church, 242; the life of Pope Callistus, 243; a favourer of the heresy of Noetus, 244; M. Bunsen's views on theological subjects, 245; his researches on the ancient Liturgies, 246; the universal priesthood of Christians as a leading dogma, 247; collection of Liturgies, 248; Ritualists in England, 249; remarks on Mr. Palmer's "Origines Liturgicæ," 250; and on Mr. Neale's History of the "Holy Oriental Church," 251; M. Bunsen's antiquarian researches on the Eucharistic Service, 252; comparison between the Alexandrian and Ethiopic Liturgies, 253; the Liturgy of St. Mark, 254; and the Abyssinian, 255, 256; its antiquity, 257; three texts of the Alexandrian Liturgy, 258; the Liturgy of St. James, 259; the Liturgy of Antioch, 260; the parent of the Byzantine rites, 261; additional documents

on these, 262; the African Liturgies, 263; the Roman Liturgy, 264; the Oblation Prayer, 265; notice of the liturgical labours of Chevalier Bunsen, 266.

Chants, *The English Psalter adapted to the Ancient Ecclesiastical*, 211.

Church, the Government, and the Elections, the, 116; Lord Derby's government, 117; the Oxford election, 118; the "Guardian's" misrepresentations of a former article on Mr. Gladstone, 119, 120; the separation of Church and State, 121; Mr. Keble's defence of Mr. Gladstone, 122; not one "Liberal Churchman" returned at the recent elections, 123, 124; quarrel amongst Irish members, 125; Irish elections, 126; the "Catholic layman," 127; clerical domination in the elections, 128; Lord Derby called the author of the Six-mile Bridge massacre, 129; Archdeacon Stopford's remark on the elections, 130; Mr. Lucas' speech at Kells, 131; violation of oaths, 132, 133; Convocation, 134; considerations on this subject suggested to the Archbishop of Canterbury, 135, 136; and to Lord Derby, 137, 138; as a Christian statesman, 139; his speech on education, 140; hope and patience necessary in judging of statesmen, 141; the duty of a "Christian statesman," 142; extract from the "Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal" on this subject, 143, 144; he should take the lead of the High-Church party, 145.

Confession and Absolution, a letter to the Dean of Exeter by the Bishop, 442; Mr. Prynne's character and labours, 443; the nature of the penance he is alleged to have imposed, 444; penances

recommended by our clergy different from Romish penances, 445.

Convocation, 166; its constitution, 167; should include presbyters and laymen, 168; but made subordinate to the authority of the Episcopate, 169; therefore not to initiate measures themselves, 170; the election of deputies, 171; Mr. Browne's objection to the admission of the laity, 172; controverted, 173; evil consequence of this in the American Church, 174; popular elections unnecessary, 175; method of election proposed, 176; the powers of the laity in Convocation, 177; select committees to be appointed, 178; the subjects of deliberation, 179; Archdeacon Garbett's Charge on this matter, 180, 181; the restoration of Convocation necessary, 182.

Eardley, Sir Culling, letter from him on Protestantism in France, 217—220.

Edge, Mr., his "Vision of Peace," 58; his Lines on Asceticism, 322.

Evelyn, Alexander John, his poem of "English Alice," 196.

Evening Classes, Metropolitan Society for, the valuable services of this society and of its secretary, the Rev. C. Mackenzie, 34.

Fourth Sunday in Advent, Verses on the Collect for, 212.

Horatian Criticism, by John Murray, M.A., 147; the study of the Classics, 148; of Horace, 149; Pope's paraphrase of Horace, 150; Pope's character and genius, 151; Horace's Satires, 152; his "Apology to Augustus," 153, 154; his "Carmen Sæculare," 155; its irreverence, 156, 157; his "First Epistle to Mæcenas," 158; his "De Arte Poetica," 159; his verses on Virgil's departure, 160; Horace not a great poet, 161; his introduction of the lyric measure into Latin, 162; the causes of this, 163; Horace as a school-book, 164.

Irish Church, the, 369; Serjeant Shee's admissions respecting the Protestant Churches in Ireland, 370; astonishing that he can fraternize with Mr. Lucas, 371; the injustice of his proposed arrangements, 372; Dr. Wordsworth's Sermons on the Irish Church, 373; show which is the ancient Catholic

Church of Ireland, 374; the creed of St. Patrick, 375; his independence of Rome, 376; Ireland in the ninth century, 377; we are not indebted for Magna Charta to Romanists, 378; the fruits of Roman ascendancy in Ireland, 379; the regularity and order of the Irish Reformation, 380; Romanism usurping and schismatic, 381; Sir Francis Head's visit to an infant school, 382, 383; to the College of Maynooth, 384, 385; rules for admission, 386; extract from one of their books of devotion, 387; their daily routine, 388; the degraded condition of the Irish people, 389; caused by the enormous power of the priesthood, 390, 391; their conduct at the recent elections, 392; various instances given, 393; they exhort to murder and force of arms, 394; the practical results of their preaching, 395, 396; should deter any thought of appropriating the property of the Irish Church to them, 397; Sir Francis Head's appeal to the priests, 398; his description of the failure of Mr. Pitt's project, 399; yet strangely, he advocates a continuance of the grant to Maynooth, 400; strong objections to this, as well as to sending an ambassador to Rome, 401; Serjeant Shee's statistics worthless, 402; Archdeacon Stopford remarks on his position, 403; and exposes his fallacies, 404; on certain clerical incomes, 405; the living of Kells, 406; enormous blunders in his figures, 407; his assertion, that archdeacons have no duties, 408; the gross injustice of his proposal for providing a "surplus fund," 409, 410; his idea that the Church is the cause of all difficulties, amusingly answered, 410; which of the two communions is schismatic, 412; the title to Irish Church property, 413; vested in the legitimate successors of the first bishops, 414; objections answered, 415; the facts of the case, 416; the union of the Churches dates from A.D. 1172, 417; increased endowment strangely asked, when numbers are leaving Romanism, 418, 419; two millions have become Protestants, 420; the Irish Church Missions, 421; carried on with the concurrence of the bishops, 422, 423; no cause for distrust of their operations, 424.

Italian Schools, the Philosophy of the, by Ausonio Franchi, 454; Christianity and the system of the Church upheld

equally and on the same authority, 455; Franchi's account of his early piety, 456; the first infusion of doubts into his heart, 457; philosophy no longer possible in Italy, 458, 459; Christianity and the Church no hold on the hearts of the people, 460; see the examples of Piedmont and Rome, 461; Italy no longer Catholic, 462; nor disposed to become Protestant, 463.

Kingsley, Rev. Charles, a Christian Socialist, 267; his Sermons on "Religion not Godliness," 268; on "The King of the Earth," 269; Mr. K.'s views on Christ's second advent, 270—272; on the universal Kingship of Christ, 273; defectiveness and partiality of his teaching, 274; a warning urged on him, 275, 276; his Sermon on Holy Scripture, 277; vague and crude notions on the interpretation of Scripture, 278; Sermon on Christmas, 279; on Good Friday, 280: the crucified Christ, a King, 281; a startling statement, 282; full of misplaced comfort, 283; Sermon on Easter-day, 284; Antinomianism of its teaching, 285; a bastard charity the fashion of these days, 286; comparison of Dr. Hook's teaching, 287; Sermon on the Holy Eucharist, 288; the teaching and doing recommended, 289, 290.

Lincoln, History of the Bishopric of, 192; curious discovery of an ancient geological museum in one of the Hebrides, 193.

London City Mission; the faults of its emissaries, 29, 30.

Macaulay, Mr.; his Lays of Rome, 162.

Mayhew, Mr. Henry; his work on London Labour and the London Poor, 1.

Milton Davenant, by the Rev. James Bandinel, 317; a severe castigation of all Romanizing, 318; asceticism, 319; lines from "the Baptistry" on this subject, 320; and Dr. Pusey's views, 321; lines from Montgomery's "Christian Life," 322; and from Mr. Edge's "Vision of Peace," 323; apostasy would seem impossible in a saint, 324; a morbid asceticism a great cause of apostasy, 325; Mr. Bandinel as an author, 326; graphic description of various clerical characters, 327—329; spiritual direction, 330; Romanizing, 331; the Jesuit Pym, 332; death-scene of the Rev. Walpole Snoreham,

333; Lord Ducandraque, 334; defects in Mr. Bandinel's work, 335; extract on enjoyment and duties, 336; short extracts, 337—339.

Missions of the English Church, 354; various Missionary Societies, 355; the Rev. W. A. B. Johnson, 356; sent as a schoolmaster to Sierra Leone, 357; the marvellous effects of his teaching as a missionary, 358; his life at Regent's Town, 359; Easter, 1817, with his people, 360; excessive manifestations of feeling, 361; its dangers shown in a letter from the Church Missionary Society, 362; the testimony of other missionaries to the state of Regent's Town, 363; Mr. Johnson's attachment to the Liturgy, 364; his need of assistance, 365; he embarks for England, 366; and dies on the voyage, 367; general remarks on his character, 368.

Montgomery, the Rev. Robert, his Lines of Asceticism from the "Christian Life," 322; his "Hero's Funeral," 430; the procession, 431; Wellington the "perfect model of an Englishman," 432.

Neale, Mr., his History of the Holy Oriental Church, 251.

Palmer, Rev. Mr., the Chevalier Bunsen's Criticisms on his "Origines Liturgicæ," 249—251.

Parochial Visitation, 1; the homes of the poor, 2; their many miseries, 3; and need of some enjoyment, 4; call for charity in judging, 5; and relieving them, 6; and cheerful sympathy, 7; the clergy should act as almoners, 8; opening a path for spiritual influence, 9, 10; the need of special services for the poor, 11; like those provided for the Romanists, 12; the formal separation of the sexes in church not advocated, 13, 14; and pews should be let for only two services, 15; hindrances among the poor to church attendance, 16; lay visitors, 17; an assistance, but not a substitute for the clergy, 18; a clerical day of visiting described, 19; rough receptions often changed to kindly partings, 20; kind words for the children, 21; modes of dealing with Romanists and Dissenters, 22, 23; the case of a young widow, 24; of a dying boy, 25; and of a poor Frenchman, 26, 27; relief not to be given without visiting, 28; the

inmates of a London court, 29; the London City Missionaries, 30; various cases of poor families described, 31, 32; the virtues of the poor, 33; evening classes and lectures recommended, 34; and a popular Church newspaper, 35; the purses of the laity a necessary assistance, 36; but love alone can effect the moral miracle desired, 37.

Penny Post, the, 184; Romanizing periodicals, 185; of which number is the "Penny Post," 186; see the notice of St. Giles, 187; injudicious selection of a tract of the Rev. H. Newland, 188; the "Heart-Stone," 189; and "Goldsmith Eligius," 190; all giving much subjects for regret, 191.

Pusey, Rev. Dr., his Letters to the Earl of Shaftesbury and Sir John Romilly, 199; his views on asceticism, 321.

Ragged School Churches, the establishment of, advocated by the Rev. W. E. Richardson, 435; tried with good success at Northampton, 436.

Regia Natalitia; a Poem, by John Murray, M.A., 147.

Romanism an apostate Church, by Non-Clericus, 448; extracts from the "Rambler" on the crusade commenced by it against the Church, 449.

Rule of the Church, the, a Law to all her Members, by Rev. J. Christie, 439; her voice to be obeyed in all things, small and great, 440; a notion founded on a mistaken view, 441.

"*Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal*," extract from the, on the duties of a Christian statesman, 143, 144.

Scripture Readers' Society, the Church of England, a society doing much good, 30.

Spain, the practical Working of the Church in, 56; the Rev. James Meyrick's inspection of it, 57; disappointments felt by apostates to Rome, 58; causes of their defection, 59; the cathedral at Malaga, 60; religious state of the people, 61; worship of the blessed Virgin, 62, 63; as popularly taught, 64; a sermon at Seville on this subject, 65; the testimony of a Mahomedan on this subject, 66; fearful instance of Mariolatry at Grenada, 67; image-worship, 68; strictures on defection from our Church, 69, 70; the Esparteran "Hampden case," 71—75; burials of

the poor, 76; the *Casa de Mendicidá*, 77, 78; various evils in the Church of Spain, 79.

St. Bernard, Life and Times of, by Dr. Augustus Neander, 291; he founds the Abbey of Clairvaux, 292; his instruction sought by numbers, 293; persecuted by Louis VI., 294; his part in settling the contest of the rival popes, 295; his successful menace against William IX. of Aquitaine, 296; he reproves Abelard, 297; his letter on the elevation of one of his monks to the papal crown, 298; Bernard's regulations for the German Church, 299; his "season of misfortunes," 300; his death, 301; the general fever of conventual devotion, 302; its effect upon Bernard, 303; his disposition and personal appearance, 304; Abbot Haimo's account of the building of a monastery, 305; St. Bernard the reality without the name of power, 306; simplicity of his habits, 307; his contests and controversies, 308; a great peacemaker, 309; his resignation of power, 310; his feelings on the election of Pope Eugenius, 311; and advice to him, 312; he exhorts the Emperor Conrad to fight for the Pope, 313; his Book of Considerations, 314; general review of his character, 315.

St. John the Evangelist's Day, verses on, 212.

Talfourd, Sir T. N., the eleventh edition of his dramatic works, 445; lines on the character of Ion, 446; his delightful vacation rambles, 447; his abhorrence of Lord Byron, 448.

Tennyson, Alfred, the poet of the age, 425; his Ode on the Death of the Duke of Wellington, 426; reply to one line in it, 427; Wellington as a statesman, 428.

Thoughts in Past Years, the sixth edition of, 452; lines on dallying with sin, 453; and on the silkworm, 454.

Tyler, the Rev. J. Endell, his Sermon and Address, 38; his exposition of 1 Cor. xv. 22. 39; on the intermediate state, 40; extract from "Yeast" on this subject, 41, 42; future retribution, 43; Fuller's thoughts on this, 44; our Lord's second advent, 45; the Burial Service, 46, 47; altered in the American Service, 48; objections answered, 49; prayer for the dead, 50; Mr. Tyler's address to his parishioners, 51.

on the *insulation* of death, 52; he exhorts to entire abstinence from controversy, 53; an exception proposed to this rule, 54, 55.

Uncle Tom's Cabin, by Mrs. Stowe, 80; slavery inconsistent with Christianity, 81, 82; Mrs. Stowe as an authoress, 83; the opening chapter of her work, 84—88; the slave-dealer, 89; the brighter side of the picture, 90; the history of George Harris, 91, 92; his wife's remonstrances with him, 93—95; similarity between the Irish and negro character, 96; the Methodist meeting at Uncle Tom's, 97; "Evangeline," 98; her father's house, 99; a


conversation on slavery, 100—102; evil in its *essence*, and not only *abuse*, 103; Evangeline's death, 104—112; Tom's sufferings and death, 113; negro emancipation, 114, 115.


Visiting and Relief Association, the Metropolitan, a most valuable institution, 18.


Williams, Rev. Isaac, Lines from his "Baptistery" on Rome, 320.

"*Yeast*," a *Problem*, extract from it, on the intermediate state, 41.

END OF VOL. XVIII.







FOUND

SEP 21 1949

**UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY**



